THE
6 PERCENT
EFFORT
James A. Colin

JURY NULLIFICATION

In a criminal jury trial in the United States, every individual juror has the lawful right to vote “Not Guilty” even if the evidence presented by the state clearly proves that the defendant technically violated the law. This is known as jury nullification. It typically occurs when a juror believes that the law itself is unconstitutional, unjust, misapplied, or being used to produce an immoral or improper result. However, no “legitimate” rationale is even necessary. The vote belongs to each juror and is that juror's decision alone. The juror votes to acquit (“Not Guilty”) as a matter of their own conscience — regardless of the judge's instructions or the opinions of the other jurors. That is the law.

This principle is older than the United States of America. In 1670, Englishman William Penn was charged with “unlawful assembly” pursuant to the Conventicle Act of 1664, which prohibited religious assemblies of five or more persons outside the Church of England, declaring them “unlawful and tumultuous.” The jury of 12 refused to convict Penn of the “crime” despite clear evidence of his “guilt” under the law. The trial judge took exception, and demanded that the jury start over and return a guilty verdict and convict Penn of the crime. However, the entire righteous jury refused to relent, even after three new verdicts were ordered by the judge over two days. Their final verdict was “Not Guilty,” and Penn was acquitted of the “crime.” The angry judge responded by fining each juror 40 marks (about $8,000 in 2025 U.S. dollars) for contempt (for a “false” verdict) and imprisoning them indefinitely until the fine was paid in full. That is the ruling class.

Jury member Edward Bushel refused to pay the fine and appealed the judge's ruling. In Bushel's Case (1670) Vaughan 135; 124 ER 1006, the higher court reversed the trial judge and ruled that jurors must be free to deliver verdicts according to their own judgment, and may not be punished for their vote. Bushel's Case became a foundational precedent for jury independence, and a cornerstone of “freedom” under both English and American law.

In Georgia v. Brailsford, 3 U.S. 1 (1794), the United States Supreme Court, acting as a trial court under its original jurisdiction, affirmed the jury's inherent authority and right to judge both the law and the facts in a trial. The first Chief Justice John Jay instructed the jury:

“You have a right to take upon yourselves to judge of both, and to determine the law as well as the fact in controversy.”

This rare Supreme Court trial instruction from February 1794 supports the principle of jury nullification as an unalienable legal right, and highlights the American jury's historical role as a critical check on government power.

But in 1895, under pressure from “elites” and the powerful business interests of the Gilded Age, the supreme court created new “law” through dishonesty and semantics. In Sparf & Hansen v. United States, 156 U.S. 51 (1895), the court insisted that jury nullification is not a right, but only a mere “physical power.” It acknowledged Bushel's Case, reframed the issue, and expanded government power through censorship and lies, openly attacking the critical check on tyranny. Now, according to the government's highest court, judges in the United States are not required to inform jurors of their actual rights, but instead may actively conceal those rights, and lie to the jurors, while preventing appropriate juror participation and fair jury deliberations. That is “law” by the ruling class.

The court's 7–2 position in Sparf was not grounded in reality, but a workaround, institutionally motivated to further empower government. It invented a new requirement to call something a “right” – court approval – and declared that this undeniable right didn't have it. In other words, the right remains, but the court lies and pretends it's not a right. The ruling, not surprisingly, prioritized judicial control and government power over individual rights and jury independence. Thus, the truth concerning jury nullification has been censored for 130 years, and a fair and impartial jury no longer exists in the United States. Judges concocted “law” to steal power and keep jurors ignorant and submissive. Sparf.

Nevertheless, the established legal right of jury nullification has been used throughout American history to oppose immoral laws and restrict the power of tyrannical government. In the 1850s, Northern juries refused to convict under the Fugitive Slave Act, upholding human dignity against insanely evil unconscionable laws – helping to end chattel slavery. In the 1920s, juries rejected Prohibition, aiding in its 1933 repeal, by acquitting many alcohol “offenders.” Since the 1960s, juries have sporadically embraced truth – and nullified charges for gun “crimes,” raw milk sales, and many drug “crimes.” No victim. No crime. The jury decides.

Jury nullification is a powerful individual right unlike any other. Just one informed juror can make a real difference. Your single vote can prevent a criminal conviction and cause a mistrial, or even lead to dismissal of charges. Jurors are never required to explain their vote and cannot be punished for their vote. If the entire jury agrees to acquit, the “Not Guilty” verdict stands – Final. Never in United States history has any juror ever been punished for exercising their right to vote their conscience. This proves jury nullification is a powerful legal right, not a mere lawless power as the government falsely claims. See Sparf.

Jury nullification is not improper disobedience, or lawless defiance, or an abuse of the system, although it is falsely portrayed as such by the government. It is a legal right – and a lawful part of the legal system for centuries. It is a rare constitutional safeguard against unjust power insanely imposed by tyrannical politicians, and violently enforced by unquestioning police. Jury nullification is a right that belongs to the People, and every individual juror — maybe you.

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION **2.** “LAW” **3.** LIES **4.** JUDGES **5.** MOVEMENT

“In those days there was no king in Israel. Everyone did what was right in his own eyes.”

-Judges 17:6 (ESV)

The author dedicates this entire book to the public domain worldwide. No rights reserved. As far as I'm concerned, you may copy, distribute, modify, or adapt any & every page of this book for any purpose whatsoever – without any permission at all required. The book is a 102-page PDF file.

INTRODUCTION

TO THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES:

You are being ruled.

You are a dominated subject of the lowest order, also known as a taxpaying U.S. citizen. In other words, a slave. You owe "your" multiple overlapping lying governments everything, from birth to death, and must do exactly what they say, or if caught you will be punished and caged. If you want out, you have to buy your way out, because you are owned property. Tax cattle. Livestock. And you'll also have to find yourself a new master, as "statelessness" is not allowed. Slave.

You can never actually own real property, but instead must pay the government forever for the privilege of pretending to own. "Your" property is subject to yearly government seizure, and is insanely taxed based upon government-created inflation and unrealized capital "gains." You must peacefully allow all of your governments and their many violent agents to steal from you, indoctrinate you, lie to you, keep track of you, harass you, and totally control you. That is the law. You are subject to more jurisdictions, bureaucracies, laws, rules, and regulations than the citizens of any other country in the history of mankind. And you will be hunted down like a dog for even the tiniest of made-up infractions.

You are expressly subject to "slavery" if you are ever "convicted" of any so-called "crime." See 13th Amendment. And it is a crime to withhold from government the unlimited amount of your time, wealth, and effort that government is allowed to steal from you. It is also a crime to satisfy your born appetites that harm nobody at all. That is your stark so-called "social contract." They say you are bound by it, and you are held bound to it through extreme force and outrageous violence, although you never actually agreed or consented to anything at all. You are also instructed that you are "free" and living in a "shining city upon a hill," and many of you are delusional enough to actually believe that crazy government nonsense. Really, you are a subjugated slave without being convicted of anything at all.

Your many "sovereign" rulers assert the right to insanely punish you for doing absolutely nothing wrong. They can put you on trial again for the same "offense" even after an acquittal – plus, on a whim, punish you cumulatively in multiple all-powerful "separate sovereign" jurisdictions. Gamble v. United States, 587 U.S. 678 (2019). But they have the audacity to declare that the Constitution is being respected – which prohibits double jeopardy. The rulers insist you agreed to everything hundreds of years ago, and are thereby bound by all of the tyrannical rules. Ultimately, you can be kidnapped and held, or even killed, by the U.S. government, at a moment's notice, anywhere in the world, for just being alive. And every government abuse is justified every single time. Through force and lies. The King is always right – and immune from all punishment. That is the law.

UNITED STATES "justice" SYSTEM

The so-called Bill of Rights means almost nothing today, as the U.S. Constitution has been systematically undermined and distorted by the corrupt judiciary—since 1803. Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137 (1803). It is just a piece of parchment now, with its supposed protections mostly defunct and ignored. The many branches and tentacles of U.S. government all work together, in concert and synergistically, expressly designed and devoted to expand government and benefit the ruling class. Your God-given unalienable right to self-defense and armament is not respected at all, even though it is uniquely and expressly enshrined in writing: "[T]he right of the people to keep and bear Arms, **shall not be infringed."**

Instead, the express unalienable right is denied and spit upon by government, at every branch and every level, every time. The absolute God-given right is falsely claimed to be not absolute. Surprise. The dishonest corrupt government judiciary rejects the English language, and claims government CAN infringe unalienable gun rights, just like most rights, which are of course limited and always subject to new and further infringements at government's whim.

> **"We can take away rights just as we can grant new ones. Don't think that it's a one-way street."**

-Antonin Scalia (1936–2016)
U.S. supreme court "justice" – In 2004.

> **"Like most rights, the right secured by the Second Amendment is not unlimited."**

District of Columbia v. Heller, 554 U.S. 570 (2008) (Scalia, J.- "granting" limited gun rights - 5 to 4).

The four dissenting "justices" in Heller actually held that there is no individual right to bear Arms at all. None. Seriously. Likewise, in many states today, your self-defense rights are effectively held non-existent. Those "justices" and renegade state governments want you disarmed and helpless, dependent upon their jack-booted police thugs who routinely arrive in ten minutes when seconds count. Then the tyrants take a report. And maybe arrest you for your trouble. Indeed, the only reason you have any government "right" to bear Arms in 2025 is because one extra politically appointed "justice" in 2008 thought so. Fact.

Ultimately, the United States government always stands up for the Bill of Rights, except when it limits government's power somehow, or needs to be ignored for some other governmental reason. That is the law. A joke.

During criminal trials, judges declare what the law is, and then lawlessly refuse to instruct the jurors that they each have an absolute right to nullify it. Sparf & Hansen v. United States, 156 U.S. 51 (1895). But the government is actually lying, and cheating, and censoring, and stealing your rights. Surprise. That is the law.

“For my friends, everything; for my enemies, the law.”

-Óscar R. Benavides (1876-1945)
Peruvian dictator. Authoritarian fascist.

JUNE 13, 2024

I'm extremely proud of my son Hunter. He has overcome an addiction. He hhuh he's one of the brightest most decent men I know. And I am satisfied that I'm not going to do anything. I said I abide by the jury decision. I will do that. And I will not pardon him.

NOVEMBER 9, 2022

Well, umm, we just have to demonstrate that he will not take power uh, by, uh, if we, if he does run, I'm making sure he, uhh, under legitimate efforts of, uh, our Constitution, does not become the next President again. Ummmm.

NOVEMBER 15, 2022

Donald Trump officially announces his candidacy for 2024 U.S. President.

NOVEMBER 18, 2022

Matthew Colangelo, Joe Biden's 3rd-highest ranking Department of "justice" official, resigns.

Attorney General Merrick "[redacted]" Garland appoints Jack Smith to create and prosecute federal cases against Donald John Trump.

Nathan Wade, IN RE 2 MAY 2022 SPECIAL PURPOSE GRAND JURY Fulton County, Georgia special prosecutor meets for eight (8) hours with White House lawyers.

DECEMBER 5, 2022

D.A. Matthew Colangelo starts his new job as "senior" prosecutor with the office of Manhattan District Attorney Alvin Bragg.

Be It Known, That This Day, I, Joseph R. Biden, Jr., President of the United States, Pursuant to My Powers Under Article II, Section 2, Clause 1, of the Constitution, Have Granted Unto

ROBERT HUNTER BIDEN

A Full and Unconditional Pardon

For those offenses against the United States which he has committed or may have committed or taken part in during the period from January 1, 2014 through December 1, 2024, including but not limited to all offenses charged or prosecuted (including any that have resulted in convictions) by Special Counsel David C. Weiss in Docket No. 1:23-cr-00061-MN in the United States District Court for the District of Delaware and Docket No. 2:23-CR-00599-MCS-1 in the United States District Court for the Central District of California.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF I have hereunto signed my name and caused the Pardon to be recorded with the Department of Justice.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR.
President

Done at the City of Washington this 1st day of December in the year of our Lord Two Thousand and Twenty-four and of the Independence of the United States the Two Hundred and Forty-ninth.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
January 20, 2025

LIES

~~Statement~~ from President Joe Biden

Our nation relies on dedicated, selfless public servants every day. They are the lifeblood of our democracy.

Yet alarmingly, public servants have been subjected to ongoing threats and intimidation for faithfully discharging their duties.

In certain cases, some have even been threatened with criminal prosecutions, including General Mark A. Milley, Dr. Anthony S. Fauci, and the members and staff of the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol. These public servants have served our nation with honor and distinction and do not deserve to be the targets of unjustified and politically motivated prosecutions.

General Milley served our nation for more than 40 years, serving in multiple command and leadership posts and deploying to some of the most dangerous parts of the world to protect and defend democracy. As Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, he guided our Armed Forces through complex global security threats and strengthened our existing alliances while forging new ones.

For more than half a century, Dr. Fauci served our country. He saved countless lives by managing the government's response to pressing health crises, including HIV/AIDS, as well as the Ebola and Zika viruses. During his tenure as my Chief Medical Advisor, he helped the country tackle a once-in-a-century pandemic. The United States is safer and healthier because of him.

On January 6, 2021, American democracy was tested when a mob of insurrectionists attacked the Capitol in an attempt to overturn a fair and free election by force and violence. In light of the significance of that day, Congress established the bipartisan Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol to investigate and report upon the facts, circumstances, and causes of the insurrection. The Select Committee fulfilled this mission with integrity and a commitment to discovering the truth. Rather than accept accountability, those who perpetrated the January 6th attack have taken every opportunity to undermine and intimidate those who participated in the Select Committee in an attempt to rewrite history, erase the stain of January 6th for partisan gain, and seek revenge, including by threatening criminal prosecutions.

I believe in the rule of law, and I am optimistic that the strength of our legal institutions will ultimately prevail over politics. But these are exceptional circumstances, and I cannot in good conscience do nothing. Baseless and politically motivated investigations wreak havoc on the lives, safety, and financial security of targeted individuals and their families. Even when individuals have done nothing wrong—and in fact have done the right thing—and will ultimately be exonerated, the mere fact of being investigated or prosecuted can irreparably damage reputations and finances.

That is why I am exercising my authority under the Constitution to pardon General Mark A. Milley, Dr. Anthony S. Fauci, the Members of Congress and staff who served on the Select Committee, and the U.S. Capitol and D.C. Metropolitan police officers who testified before the Select Committee. The issuance of these pardons should not be mistaken as an acknowledgement that any individual engaged in any wrongdoing, nor should acceptance be misconstrued as an admission of guilt for any offense. Our nation owes these public servants a debt of gratitude for their tireless commitment to our country.

###



LVL

When somebody is the President of the United States, the authority is total.

And that's the way it's got to be.

It's total.

"The homegrowns are next."

- Donald Trump, April 14, 2025

"man of Lawlessness"

2 Thessalonians 2:3~4

Just a few of Trump's Pardons:

SHERIFFS:

Joe Arpaio (Arizona, pardoned Aug 2017)
Illegally targeted and terrorized Latinos in mass immigration sweeps, then defied a court order to stop the racial profiling.
Convicted of criminal contempt for openly violating civil rights — then pardoned before serving a single day in jail.

Scott Jenkins (Virginia, pardoned May 2025)
Sold law enforcement credentials by accepting bribes from unqualified applicants seeking badges and privileges.
Pocketed over $75,000 in cash-for-badge schemes — then pardoned before serving a single day of his 10-year prison sentence.

CONGRESSMEN:

Chris Collins (New York, pardoned Dec 2020)
Leaked confidential info about a failed biotech drug trial to his son, allowing his family to dump stock and save ~$700,000.
Obstructed the federal investigation by lying to F.B.I. agents about his insider trading.

Michael Grimm (New York, pardoned May 2025)
Filed false tax returns to hide nearly $1 million in income from his Manhattan restaurant, Healthalicious.
Threatened to throw a curious reporter "off this fucking balcony" when asked about his ongoing campaign finance investigation.

Duncan Hunter (California, pardoned Dec 2020)
Stole $250,000 in campaign funds to finance lavish trips, personal expenses, and multiple extramarital affairs.
Blew donor money on vacations, video games, and mistresses — then cried political persecution.

Rick Renzi (Arizona, pardoned Jan 2021)
Used his congressional office to broker a phony land deal, taking bribes and laundering money through his family.
Convicted of racketeering, extortion, and corruption in a scheme that turned legislation into personal profit.

Steve Stockman (Texas, sentence commuted Dec 2020)
Solicited $1.25 million in charity donations, then blew it on himself for luxury travel, apartments, and surveillance.
Claimed to be a Christian conservative while embezzling money meant for voter education and orphan care.

D-LIST CELEBRITIES:

Todd & Julie Chrisley (pardoned May 2025)
Defrauded banks out of $30 million by faking income and submitting forged documents, plus committed tax evasion.
Lived a luxury lifestyle on stolen money while showing off their unearned wealth on national television.

RELATIVES:

Charles Kushner - Father-In-Law of Ivanka Trump (pardoned Dec 2020). Confirmed in 2025 as U.S. Ambassador to France & Monaco.
Pleaded guilty to tax evasion, illegal campaign donations, and retaliating against a witness with a prostitute.
Orchestrated a filmed sex trap against his own brother-in-law to silence testimony in their family feud.

TRUMP'S RECORD ON THE SECOND AMENDMENT

- Banned Bump Stocks
- Signed "Fix NICS" to expand Prohibited Persons faulty database
- Supported Red Flag Gun Confiscation
- Supported Raising Minimum Age to Purchase Firearms
- Told British TV he was "going to seriously look at" banning suppressors and ignored legislation to deregulate suppressors
- Supports TAPS Act (Big Brother social media monitoring of firearms statements)
- Supported Expanding background checks (registration) with Toomey-Manchin
- Quipped about wanting to "terminate parts of the Constitution"
- Told Sen. Feinstein to include "Assault Weapons" Ban in School Safety bill

"Take the guns first, go through due process second." - President Donald Trump 2/28/18

Donald J. Trump @realDonaldTrump

Obama Administration legalized bump stocks. BAD IDEA. As I promised, today the Department of Justice will issue the rule banning BUMP STOCKS with a mandated comment period. We will BAN all devices that turn legal weapons into illegal machine guns.

1:50 PM · Mar 23, 2018

Trump vows to push comprehensive gun background checks: 'Raise age to 21'

Donald J. Trump @realDonaldTrump

I will be strongly pushing Comprehensive Background Checks with an emphasis on Mental Health. Raise age to 21 and end sale of Bump Stocks! Congress is in a mood to finally do something on this issue - I hope!

5:13 AM · Feb 22, 2018

Donald J. Trump @realDonaldTrump · Follow

Nobody should be allowed to burn the American flag - if they do, there must be consequences - perhaps loss of citizenship or year in jail!

RETWEETS 52,675 LIKES 146,872

3:55 AM - 29 Nov 2016

LVL

2. "LAW"

"The state calls its own violence law, but that of the individual crime."

-Max Stirner (1806–1856)
German philosopher and individualist anarchist.

"Such was law; and it has maintained its two-fold character to this day. Its origin is the desire of the ruling class to give permanence to customs imposed by themselves for their own advantage. Its character is the skilful commingling of customs useful to society, customs which have no need of law to insure respect, with other customs useful only to rulers, injurious to the mass of the people, and maintained only by the fear of punishment."

-Pëtr Kropotkin (1842–1921)
Russian philosopher and anarcho-communist.

"The most absurd apology for authority and law is that they serve to diminish crime. Aside from the fact that the state is itself the greatest criminal, breaking every written and natural law, stealing in the form of taxes, killing in the form of war and capital punishment, it has come to an absolute standstill in coping with crime. It has failed utterly to destroy or even minimize the horrible scourge of its own creation."

-Emma Goldman (1869–1940)
Russian philosopher and revolutionary anarchist.

“There's no way to rule innocent men. The only power any government has is the power to crack down on criminals. Well, when there aren't enough criminals, one makes them. One declares so many things to be a crime that it becomes impossible to live without breaking laws.”

-Ayn Rand (1905–1982)
Russian-American writer, philosopher, individualist, and minarchist.

“Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to summarize for you the meeting that I have just had with the bipartisan leaders, which began at eight o'clock and was completed two hours later. I began the meeting by making this statement, which I think needs to be made to the nation. America's public enemy number one in the United States is drug abuse. In order to fight and defeat this enemy, it is necessary to wage a new all out offensive. I have asked the Congress to provide the legislative authority and the funds to fuel this kind of an offensive.”

-Richard Nixon (1913–1994) – Start of the “Drug War” on June 17, 1971.
37th President of the United States. Evil lying politician. The worst of the worst.

“The escalation to attack undefended civilian targets is just a classic illustration of terrorism.”

-Noam Chomsky (1928 –)
American linguist.

THE MASS INCARCERATION ERA

CAUSED BY "Man of the People" & "Most Popular President"

"You have to face the fact that the whole problem is really the blacks.
The key is to devise a system that recognizes this all while not appearing to."

JUNE 17, 1971 LVL

"DRUG" WAR DECLARED

Male incarceration rate increases 5x within 40 years.

Female incarceration rate increases 7x within 40 years.

War on ~~Drugs~~ Peaceful and Innocent Americans
Who Voluntarily Choose to Ingest Intoxicants🙂/ Painkillers😐
Currently "forbidden" by the lawless U.S. government.

"Just as Hitler used the Reichstag burning, the U.S. government now uses the so-called two wars, the War on Drugs and the War on Terrorism, to fuel fear in the population and establish a police security state."
- Ralph Metzner
German-American psychologist, writer, and researcher.

Source: Bureau of "justice" Statistics:
"Historical Corrections Statistics in the United States" and annual "Correctional Populations in the United States" reports.

FEDERAL "CRIMES" IN THE UNITED STATES

(*estimated*– Study: Counting the Code –2019)

Authors:
GianCarlo Canaparo, Patrick McLaughlin, PhD, Jonathan Nelson and Liya Palagashvili, PhD

James Madison predicted the future in *The Federalist Papers:*

> "It will be of little avail to the people that the laws are made by men of their own choice if the laws be so voluminous that they cannot be read, or so incoherent that they cannot be understood."

Congress has spread crimes throughout the Code, resulting in what scholars have described as "an 'incomprehensible,' random and incoherent, 'duplicative, ambiguous, incomplete, and organizationally nonsensical' mass of federal legislation that carries criminal penalties."

The study used the following 12 search terms to find "crimes" within the US Code:

1. **"Shall be fined under this title, imprisoned"**
2. **"Be fined under this title or imprisoned"**
3. **"Imprisonment for not more than"**
4. **"Sentenced to imprisonment or death"**
5. **"Be fined not more than"**
6. **"Imprisoned not more than"**
7. **"Be punished by a fine"**
8. **"Shall be fined or imprisoned"**
9. **"Shall be fined"**
10. **"Shall be punished"**
11. **"Imprisoned for not more than"**
12. **"Shall be guilty of"**

Figure 1. Estimated Number of US Code Sections That Create a Federal Crime



Source: GianCarlo Canaparo et al., "Count the Code: Quantifying Federalization of Criminal Statutes" (Special Report No. 251, Heritage Foundation, Washington, DC, January 7, 2022), 12, chart 1.

Figure 2. Estimated Number of Federal Crimes



Source: GianCarlo Canaparo et al., "Count the Code: Quantifying Federalization of Criminal Statutes" (Special Report No. 251, Heritage Foundation, Washington, DC, January 7, 2022), 13, chart 1.

LVL

STATISM:

The idea that people are too stupid to be free, so you have to take their money and their freedom, by force, for their own good.

3. LIES

The law is the law – or so they say. But actually, the law is selectively and arbitrarily enforced against the poor, the weak, the unlucky, and the stupid, while being lied about, exploited, and avoided by the ruling class. So really, law has no legitimate authority, and is simply a violent aristocratic tool used to forcibly and dishonestly hold down and control the oppressed and powerless masses.

One foundational United States lie stands alone, with overwhelming evil impact. The ruling class has relied heavily upon the Sparf lie since 1895, using it to violently censor undeniable truth. Untold numbers of innocents have been wrongly imprisoned as a direct result of Sparf's illogical nonsense. Judges claim to decide the law as the final authority, forbidding the jury from doing so, although their judicial instruction is completely incapable of enforcement. The Sparf lie depends on semantics and ignorance, and stands today only through more than a century of systematic, self-serving, fear-based judicial dishonesty:

LIE LIE LIE

THE SYSTEM LIES



"Propaganda is the executive arm of the invisible government."

-Edward Bernays (1891–1995)
Austrian-American author and propaganda theorist.
Bernays, E. L. (1928). *Propaganda*.

VOTING

The United States government systematically lies to you about your voting rights as a juror. It declares an unalienable right not a right, censors the truth, and tries to keep jurors ignorant, powerless, and submissive through calculated "legal" deception. Sparf & Hansen v. United States, 156 U.S. 51 (1895). The government spins a different illusion concerning political voting, but likewise designed to manipulate and control its subjects. The rulers insist that "every vote matters" in a "representative democracy," demanding your frequent participation on that delusional basis. They pretend collective symbolic influence is individual consequentialism. They want you to vote – repeatedly – to make you think you chose "your" rulers, and that their authority is real, coming from you. Yet in reality, you are nothing but a slave to them, and the political outcome will be the same regardless of which "side" you pick. The only vote that ever truly matters as a U.S. "citizen" is the one you cast in a trial, following your conscience as a juror.

Voting in the United States is a charade, a slave ritual designed to give fake legitimacy to a system unashamedly designed to serve the wants and desires of the ruling class. It creates the illusion of personal influence, responsibility, and choice, where none actually exists. Any difference in "candidates" is confined to such a narrow approved spectrum that the outcome is effectively predetermined, regardless. The contrived notion of meaningful individual choice is nothing but a designed sham. Your "vote" has never mattered and never will.

Mathematics is the most concise and overwhelming proof of the undeniable reality of voting. You could have voted the exact "opposite" every single time, your entire life, and almost certainly nothing would have changed. This is true for every individual who has ever cast a ballot – you wasted your time. It is nearly impossible[1] for any statewide or national election to result in a tie, or have one vote influence the outcome, which is the only time your vote might matter. "Your vote matters" is a fiction – except in the jury box.

1 No individual vote has been documented to change the outcome of a U.S. statewide or national election since 1789, except in the 1839 Massachusetts gubernatorial election, where a single vote switch away from Marcus Morton would have dropped him to exactly 50% of the total vote, thereby failing the state's majority requirement (>50%) and likely resulting in 2nd-place Edward Everett's selection by the legislature. In 2025, only Georgia requires >50% of total votes in general elections for all statewide, congressional, and state legislative offices, and Louisiana requires >50% in "jungle" primary elections for these offices (with some shifting to closed primaries in 2026), where a single vote could trigger a runoff, potentially altering the outcome. No certified popular vote total for presidential, U.S. House, U.S. Senate, or other statewide elections has ever resulted in a tie or one-vote margin of victory. There are also more than 175,000 local elections annually across ~89,000 local government units. Including all local elections since 1789, it is estimated that there have been no more than 5,000 ties or one-vote margins. Therefore, with more than 20,000,000 local elections during that time, there is still at least a 99.97% chance that your local vote will be actually meaningless.

THE SYSTEM LOVES WHEN YOU THINK YOU'RE CHOOSING



Once elected, I will become a strict vegetarian.
You have my word.
ELECT ME!

UNITED STATES PRESIDENTS

with the Lowest Percentage of Eligible Voters (Post-1900)

President and Election Year	VEP Voting Eligible Population = Citizens of voting age eligible to vote.	Turnout %	Total Votes	Candidate Votes	Vote Share %	% of Eligible Voters
Woodrow Wilson (1912)	25,485,664	59.0%	15,036,542	6,296,284	41.9%	**24.7%**
Bill Clinton (1992)	179,655,523	58.1%	104,426,659	44,909,889	43.0%	**25.0%**
Bill Clinton (1996)	186,347,044	51.7%	96,277,634	47,402,357	49.2%	**25.4%**
Harry Truman (1948)	93,570,153	52.2%	48,833,680	24,179,347	49.5%	**25.8%**
George W. Bush (2000)	194,331,436	54.2%	105,405,100	50,456,002	47.9%	**26.0%**
Calvin Coolidge (1924)	59,974,595	48.9%	29,327,577	15,723,789	53.6%	**26.2%**
Richard Nixon (1968)	116,842,930	62.5%	73,026,831	31,783,783	43.5%	**27.2%**
Donald Trump (2016)	230,931,921	59.2%	136,669,276	62,984,828	46.1%	**27.3%**
Jimmy Carter (1976)	148,911,215	54.8%	81,603,346	40,831,881	50.0%	**27.4%**
Ronald Reagan (1980)	159,619,581	54.2%	86,513,813	43,904,153	50.7%	**27.5%**
⋮						
17th **Donald Trump** (2024)	243,803,423	63.7%	155,238,302	77,302,580	49.8%	**31.7%**

Sources:

- Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives, "Statistics of the Presidential and Congressional Election"
- Federal Election Commission, Official Presidential Election Results
- Michael McDonald / UF Election Lab / Elections Project, "National VEP Turnout Rates, 1789–Present"
- The World Almanac and Encyclopedia, 1912 popular vote

MANDATE?
TO RULE
YOU


HELP! THEY'RE RAPING ME!
GRASS TOUCH
NO, IT'S OKAY. WE VOTED ON IT.

The United States was founded upon lies — terrible lies and pure hypocrisy. The "elite" founders declared freedom while enshrining slavery and rejecting equality. They secretly drafted the CONstitution, exceeding their mandate to amend the Articles of Confederation. Under the law of the Articles, the CONstitution was not lawfully adopted. And ever since the day of its illegal fraudulent birth, the country's lies have festered. They have grown. They have multiplied — by design. Deceit is the lifeblood of every institution.

"The state lies in all languages of good and evil; and whatever it says it lies; and whatever it has it has stolen."

-Friedrich Nietzsche (1844–1900)
German philosopher and cultural critic.

MARBURY v. MADISON - 1803

Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137 (1803), established judicial review, empowering the supreme court to strike down laws or executive actions deemed to violate the U.S. Constitution. The decision invented this new judicial authority to check legislative and executive power, claiming it would ensure the Constitution's authority as supreme law.

"Thus, the particular phraseology of the constitution of the United States confirms and strengthens the principle, supposed to be essential to all written constitutions, that a law repugnant to the constitution is void; and that courts, as well as other departments, are bound by that instrument."

Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137, 180 (1803).

Of course, however, the court was lying, and as a direct result of judicial review, the Constitution is now subjectively interpreted to mean whatever the various politically appointed "justices" want it to mean on any given day or topic. Today, biased lifetime judges fabricate "law" on a whim. For example, the constitutional "right" to abortion was invented in 1973 by a 7–2 vote, and then rescinded in 2022 by a 5–4 vote. Roe v. Wade, 410 U.S. 113 (1973); Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization, 597 U.S. 215 (2022). More notably, despite the unprecedentedly precise words of the United States Constitution ("shall not be infringed"), there are currently many *thousands* of "laws" that directly infringe upon "the right of the people to keep and bear Arms." See Second Amendment.

THE PYRAMID OF GOVERNMENT

LVL

McCULLOCH v. MARYLAND - 1819

McCulloch v. Maryland, 17 U.S. 316 (1819), established the doctrine of implied powers, allowing the federal government to invent power and exercise authority not explicitly granted by the Constitution. The "Necessary & Proper" Clause was manipulated by the court to give Congress the power to create a national bank, and far beyond. Rather than respecting the word "necessary," it was redefined and expanded to allow virtually anything the government desires. "Necessary & Proper" became "convenient, or useful" and not otherwise unconstitutional. Through wordplay, the Clause became a rubber-stamp rather than a limit to power. Limited government was rejected and a vast federal expansion was unleashed. McCulloch laid the groundwork for the unnecessary and improper existence of unconstitutional unaccountable three-letter agencies (CIA, FBI, ATF, DEA, etc.) that today dominate the citizenry through stolen power.

THE 13TH AMENDMENT - 1865

This Amendment is claimed to have abolished slavery, but it did no such thing. Chattel slavery, where people can be bought and sold in private transactions, was abolished, but slavery and involuntary servitude were each legalized for everyone. The United States became and remains the only country in world history to specifically legalize and enshrine slavery of its own People in its Constitution. The Amendment established the government's unprecedented "constitutional" power to enslave anyone for essentially anything. "Crime" can be harmless, and there are more than 100,000 distinct "criminal" offenses in the United States today.

"Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, *except as a punishment for crime* whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction."

"BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT" & THE "GRAND" JURY

The United States government tells its subjects that if you are ever accused of a felony "crime" (generally defined as an "offense" punishable by more than one year in prison), you get a jury trial where your honest "peers" may convict you only if they unanimously find you "guilty" "beyond a reasonable doubt." There is some truth to that state propaganda, but as already discussed, the blatant lies of Sparf actually control your fate. Plus, the claim is badly misleading and terribly dishonest on a multitude of additional grounds.

Actually, only around 2–3% of felony defendants go to a jury trial, and nearly 90% of those are still convicted, thereby suffering the "trial penalty" that often results in a prison sentence 50% longer – gleefully imposed by the government judges.

Overcharging by the prosecutor coerces a plea bargain in every case it can. Overcharging is charging a defendant with more or harsher crimes than is appropriate or justified by the evidence, and is used to gain leverage for the state. That leverage is then synergistically combined with the trial penalty, the public "defender," and unfair cash bail requirements to give the state its maximum ability to force guilty pleas from the accused poor. Nearly 85% of all felony defendants are officially indigent, lacking funds to hire a lawyer. And in most cases the defendant's jurors won't be their peers. Jurors are typically older registered voters who are often naive statists, biased, timid, and ignorant. Any prospective juror who admits to actually knowing their real rights as a juror is systematically removed from the pool. That is the "law." So as a practical matter, almost nobody really gets a criminal jury trial in America – or wants one.

"Beyond a reasonable doubt" is an undefinable subjective standard in the first place, and plays only a small real role in the United States criminal "justice" system today. It is of actual importance in only around 10% of cases, give or take, the 2–3% that go to trial, plus the approximately 7–8% who win the game, and somehow get their cases dismissed. That's 10%. Ninety percent (90%) of felony defendants plead GUILTY, meaning "probable cause" was the standard for them, no matter what deal they got. "Beyond a reasonable doubt" is useful mostly as a propaganda tool, and means very little in the real world of the controlling CONstitution where "crime" makes you a state-owned slave – constitutionally.

In most states, for most felony crimes, prosecutors can just draft up some charges called a "Complaint" that need only meet the probable cause standard, the same standard used by the police to get you arrested and jailed. "Probable cause" is simply a "reasonable belief" that a person committed a "crime." Only ~10–25% of cases then have a preliminary hearing, where a judge agrees there is probable cause more than 95% of the time. After probable cause is found, or the hearing is waived (~75–90%), the final "Information" is filed. So the prosecutor's "belief" is the true standard – minimal and subjective – used to imprison and enslave.

Lives are ruined by the beliefs of the rulers every single day, and the rulers' beliefs are mostly not reasonable. That is government and crime, in a nutshell. Charges are derived from mere "probable cause" often without a real victim, and are routinely overcharged. Then, those maximum conceivable allegations are used to coerce a plea bargain out of the weak and usually poor defendant/subject.

Some states also use secret "grand" juries to charge/indict criminals, which are assembled bodies of "citizens" who hear evidence from prosecutors and authorize criminal charges in an "Indictment." Only about 20 states and the federal government use grand juries with any frequency, and the standard they all use is still just probable cause. And it's a majority vote, not unanimous. Only the federal government, New York, and Ohio use grand juries as their primary charging mechanism. The grand jury was once claimed to be a legitimate citizen check on government, but that is a bad joke today. Nonsense. It is a rubber stamp.

“The district attorney could get the grand jury to indict a ham sandwich if he wanted to.”

-Unnamed Rochester, New York criminal defense attorney - 1979.

The saying is often falsely attributed to Sol Wachtler, who repeated something similar in 1985 after he was appointed to be the Chief judge of New York where he "served" until 1992. In 1993, Wachtler was indicted for extortion and other crimes, was convicted, and was sent to federal prison.

INDICTED

YEAR	FEDERAL Grand Jury Hours	Criminal Cases Filed	Grand Jury Hours Per Case
1985	62,184	29,689	2.1
1990	72,140	36,042	2.0
1995	69,579	36,878	1.9
2000	54,745	52,887	1.0
2005	48,570	60,062	0.8
2006	44,652	58,702	0.8
2007	44,977	59,228	0.8
2008	53,979	63,042	0.9
2009	45,392	67,864	0.7
2010	39,433	68,591	0.6
2011	36,705	68,926	0.5
2012	34,938	63,118	0.6
2013	34,861	61,529	0.6
2014	31,049	56,218	0.6
2015	29,019	54,928	0.5
2016	27,332	53,908	0.5
2017	27,007	53,899	0.5
2018	28,004	64,222	0.4

99.99%

In FY 2010, 11 out of 162,351 "proposed" indictments were rejected by a federal grand jury. That is about 1 in 15,000 rejected. And the Feds won't even release official data for any other years, which means those numbers are probably even worse for the downtrodden slaves...

LVL

The Fifth Amendment requires that a Grand Jury indict you for federal felonies, but the centuries-old procedure, held in total secrecy, is not an actual check on power. It is simply another state-stolen power with pretend citizen involvement. The "independent" grand jury is a joke, and no longer exists as a practical matter. It is a waste of time, a sham, and a failed institution. Today, ~99.99% of proposed federal indictments are approved. That is a statistical fact, not an exaggeration. The grand jury "job" could be done by any chimpanzee – with a rubber stamp.

By the early 19th century, the federal government had consolidated power, and the judiciary had asserted dominance over the Constitution. Grand juries were fully captured by executive branch prosecutors, and neutered by judicial branch rules. For the last 200 years, indictments have been all but guaranteed. Only 12 of 23 jurors must agree that probable cause exists, and then a "true bill" is returned. You are thereby indicted, and well on your way to becoming a full-blown slave of the state. That's the system – your shining city upon a hill – pure propaganda and disingenuous lies.



The grand jury proceeding is held in secret, with no judge, no defense attorney, no cross-examination, and basically no evidentiary rules. A bare majority vote can yield an indictment (12 out of 16–23 jurors, typically 23), and inadmissible evidence is specifically allowed. Hearsay evidence, double hearsay, unverified tips, preliminary reports, coerced statements, illegal seizures, police opinions, "expert" conjecture, character attacks, and unverified snitch testimony are all considered "fair" game – routinely used to indict.

The FBI alone uses more than 15,000 confidential informants every single year, and between FY 2012 and 2018, it spent an average of $42 million annually on payments to snitches. The DEA is smaller, but even worse. "Crimes" are outright manufactured by the government, on a gigantic scale, with citizen lies bought and sold as an essential product. In truth, the grand jury proceeding is a secret government lynching. In sum, every single grand juror is worse than worthless and should be ashamed of themselves. They are just a bootlicking "citizen" cog with no independence or morals – the embodiment of the state – with blood on their hands from willfully perpetrating the violence of rubber stamp tyranny.

THE PRESUMPTION OF "INNOCENCE"

The claim that a presumption of innocence exists in the United States is a weak, hollow lie, devoid of truth for victimless "crimes" where "guilt" itself is a legal fiction. The police use their unjust "qualified" immunity to get their piece of flesh initially – arresting you – without a care in the world. Then pretrial incarceration crushes the poor, using impossible dollar amounts to facilitate prolonged kidnapping and extended human degradation. Exculpatory evidence is routinely withheld. This brutal leverage by the state tilts the scales of "justice" to forcefully induce a case-ending plea, truth be damned. Finally, the almighty plea bargain cements the grotesque coerced result, ensuring "guilt" is the real presumption.

THE PLEA "BARGAIN"

"It is not some adjunct to the criminal justice system; it *is* the criminal justice system."

Missouri v. Frye, 566 U.S. 134, 144 (2012) (emphasis in original).

Pencil-necked ruling-class pricks bicker amongst themselves about what should be done with their pawns, the accused citizen subjects. "To a large extent ... horse trading [between prosecutor and defense counsel] determines who goes to jail and for how long. That is what plea bargaining is." Missouri v. Frye at 144. Attorneys are "officers of the court" trading human livestock, and must "uphold" the law while doing so, whatever that means. In any case, they all work for the government, first and foremost, including both "sides" even if you're paying top dollar to your private criminal defense lawyer, which is rare statistically. Seventeen (17) out of 20 defendants (85%) are indigent, and 19 out of 20 (95%) convicted felons pled guilty to their "crimes" via plea bargain.

Felony plea bargains are coerced admissions of guilt based upon "probable cause" and leverage, including unlimited state resources whenever deemed necessary. They result in self-devastating consequences specifically agreed to by the target/subject itself – on the record – in their own "best" interest – "Voluntarily."

That's the system. So the public "defender" actually plays the leading role in enslaving the poor, disobedient, stupid, and/or unlucky U.S. citizens who get swept into the United States criminal "justice" system. The unprecedented "constitutional" slave state could not exist without public defenders efficiently running mass cover for their evil employer – their real client – the government.

THE PUBLIC "DEFENDER"

Public defenders are the most essential and pathetic part of the entire disgraceful system. They exist to create the illusion of required fairness, yet trade any real credibility for their government paycheck. They pretend to be overworked and underpaid while they sell their undefended "clients" down the river. They are the co-signers and beneficiaries of every unjust law they claim to fight against. Without constant "crime" and neverending threats of jail, they don't have their government jobs. They work hand-in-hand with the prosecution in every single case, and both "sides" are paid by the state. That fact speaks for itself.

Their job is to convince people that they are guilty.

THE 16TH AMENDMENT & THE "FEDERAL" RESERVE

The 16th Amendment was fraudulently "ratified" in 1913 through state-level deceptions and bogus federal certification. The unwanted Amendment enabled the IRS (then known as the BIR = Bureau of Internal Revenue) to directly tax unlimited "incomes" from "whatever source," without apportionment to the states. The theft scheme was orchestrated by "elite" bankers like J.P. Morgan and the Rothschilds in tandem with their 1913 "Federal" Reserve Act, which snuck through Congress and was signed just before Christmas on December 23, 1913. Thereby, private bankers were gifted a cartel, with immunity, to print and profit from fiat money, fund endless wars via government debt, and systematically erode the wealth of every individual. IRS Form 1040 was introduced in 1914.

It was an elaborate well-planned slow-rolled government trick. In 1913, 99% paid nothing in income tax, and less than 1% of the population was forced to pay 1% of their net income. The top tax bracket was "just" 7%. Five years later, by 1918, 6% was the *lowest* tax bracket, and the top was *77%*. This banker-engineered scam financially enslaved the masses – as planned. The 1913 dollar's purchasing power has collapsed to just 3 cents in 2025 – the designed tax of monetary debasement.

"IMMUNITY"

So-called "immunity" lifts certain people and entities above the law, shielding them from its supposed universal consequences. It is a simple concept that destroys any legitimacy law might claim. By creating exceptions – typically for itself – the state exposes the outright lie of the "rule" of law. If the rulers can exempt themselves, the law cannot claim authority over anyone. Those denied immunity could, by the same logic, simply exempt themselves from the ruler's law and impose their own. Immunity is a base tool of government, central to control, and by its very existence reveals that all law is illegitimate by design. Government breaks the law while violently forcing its lowly subjects to obey it.

The United States government embraces widespread immunity of all types. The secret English court of Star Chamber in 1607 provided the legal foundation for *judicial immunity* that today lets judges get away with a wide variety of both "innocent" and intentional misconduct, while being treated like royalty. Floyd & Barker, 77 Eng. Rep. 1305, 1307 (Star Chamber 1607) (absolute judicial immunity from all punishment "for any thing done by him as Judge."). *Prosecutorial immunity* is likewise absolute, shielding even malicious willful acts such as Brady violations where exculpatory evidence is withheld. *Sovereign immunity*, inherited from the English monarchy, protects federal/state entities from all unwanted lawsuits, regardless of wrongdoing. *Legislative immunity* absolutely protects lawmakers' official speech, votes, and debates, including those with corrupt motives. *Snitch immunity* protects informants who provide info and assistance to the government. And *"qualified" immunity* for police was invented in 1967 to allow cops to break the law without fear. Pierson v. Ray, 386 U.S. 547 (1967).

"But whether the Constitution really be one thing or another, this much is certain, that it has either authorized such a government as we have had or has been powerless to prevent it. In either case it is unfit to exist."



YOUR *REAL* MASTER

"The Rothschilds, and that class of money-lenders of whom they are the representatives and agents - men who never think of lending a shilling to their next-door neighbors, for purposes of honest industry, unless upon the most ample security, and at the highest rate of interest - stand ready, at all times, to lend money in unlimited amounts to those robbers and murderers, who call themselves governments, to be expended in shooting down those who do not submit quietly to being robbed and enslaved."

~LYSANDER SPOONER (1808–1887)
American political philosopher and individualist anarchist.

TERRY v. OHIO - 1968

One year after the police were gifted with invented "qualified" immunity by the activist and unrestrained U.S. supreme court, the same court decided to overrule the 4th Amendment for police benefit. So-called Terry stops were fabricated to make it easier for the ruling-class muscle to crack down on the uppity subjects – through hunches and made-up suspicions. By a mere vote of the court, the United States Constitution was rejected and overruled, and "reasonable suspicion" was crudely invented to replace the constitutional "probable cause" standard. The court said the unconstitutional change was necessary for "safety." Notably, the word "suspicion" is absent from the U.S. Constitution, and a "reasonable" suspicion cannot even exist within that constitutional framework. More than 50 years later, the lawless legal monstrosity is still claimed to be the law, but remains obviously unconstitutional. Terry v. Ohio, 392 U.S. 1 (1968).

Plus – these new Terry "suspicion" powers to "Stop & Frisk" could be violently exercised by the police force against the People without any real worry or concern, in light of their newly minted "above the law" status. Pierson v. Ray, 386 U.S. 547 (1967). "Qualified" immunity for police is really just another judicial sham – a fabricated doctrine by and for the ruling class. It masquerades as narrow "qualified" protection – while functioning as essentially absolute immunity for all police. Officers are immune from civil rights lawsuits unless the alleged violation is of a "clearly established" right. A right is not "clearly established" unless victims can pinpoint a prior case with nearly identical facts where relief was already granted. Unless the victims can meet this almost impossible hurdle, the right is not "clearly established" – by definition. Thus, the case is quickly dismissed on immunity grounds, without any ruling on the merits.

This devious judicial mechanism locks the system into a designed circular loop. Courts dole out immunity, refuse to rule on the merits, and prevent fresh precedents from ever establishing "clearly established" rights. As a direct result, police can more efficiently enforce the will of the ruling class – without question or consequence. That is the law.

Judicial, prosecutorial, sovereign, legislative, and "qualified" immunities shield the courts, prosecutors, states, lawmakers, and police who bring Terry to life and perpetrate its violent big brother rules. They all work together synergistically to ensure that "suspicion" will control the citizenry, and will always remain a "lawful" government weapon of abuse – Constitution be damned. Even degenerate criminal snitches — the lowest-ranking parasites of the police state — exploit the Terry tyranny by feeding fabricated tips to their government handlers. Hypocrisy abounds, and lawless suspicion rules.

Ultimately, Terry v. Ohio ensures that government suspicion and government violence are always allowed, encouraged, and justified – to spite you.



"The State represents violence in a concentrated and organized form. The individual has a soul, but as the State is a soulless machine, it can never be weaned from violence to which it owes its very existence."

-Mahatma Gandhi (1869–1948)

Indian "independence" leader who popularized non-violent resistance = Satyagraha.
Assassinated in 1948 by a Hindu nationalist at a "multi-faith" prayer meeting.



DOUBLE JEOPARDY "PROTECTION"

"No person shall . . . be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb."

See Fifth Amendment. This means you cannot be tried twice for the same crime.

But with the lawless invented "dual sovereignty" doctrine, an acquittal does not bar successive criminal prosecutions for the same offense. The Constitution is overruled, and double jeopardy is allowed. You can be found "Not Guilty" at trial, and another overlapping government can just put you on trial again for the exact same offense. This lawless doctrine allows unlimited U.S. governments — state, federal, and even tribal – to consecutively prosecute the same offense if somehow jurisdiction can be established. According to "supreme" court dictate, an offense cannot be "the same" if multiple governments each want to punish you for it.

The obviously unconstitutional doctrine is claimed to be "rarely" invoked, but was set up by the ruling class to ensure that lawless tyranny is allowed whenever deemed necessary. It is employed primarily as a means of "correcting" "aberrant" jury verdicts and "guarding" against jury nullification. So really, it is just an unconstitutional discretionary check against law and fairness, to be trotted out at the lawless whim of one of your many controlling masters. Gamble v. United States, 587 U.S. 678 (2019) ("Yes, our Constitution rests on the principle that the people are sovereign, but that does not mean that they have conferred all the attributes of sovereignty on a single government. Instead, the people, by adopting the Constitution, " 'split the atom of sovereignty.' " . . . Thus, both the Federal Government and the States wield sovereign powers, and that is why our system of government is said to be one of 'dual sovereignty.'"). Actually – you didn't agree to anything 200+ years ago. Actually – the made-up "doctrine" is a discretionary joke. Actually – it desecrates "federalism" to attack the powerless individual. Obviously – "justice" Gorsuch's dissent is correct:

"A free society does not allow its government to try the same individual for the same crime until it's happy with the result. Unfortunately, the Court today endorses a colossal exception to this ancient rule against double jeopardy. My colleagues say that the federal government and each State are "separate sovereigns" entitled to try the same person for the same crime. So if all

the might of one "sovereign" cannot succeed against the presumptively free individual, another may insist on the chance to try again. And if both manage to succeed, so much the better; they can add one punishment on top of the other. But this "separate sovereigns exception" to the bar against double jeopardy finds no meaningful support in the text of the Constitution, its original public meaning, structure, or history. Instead, the Constitution promises all Americans that they will never suffer double jeopardy.

I would enforce that guarantee."

Gamble v. United States, 587 U.S. 678, 737 (2019) (Gorsuch, J., dissenting).

Double jeopardy protection for citizens of the United States was intentionally devastated by the United States supreme court – beginning in 1922. The "dual sovereignty" doctrine was invented to steal more rights, and help maintain the court's obvious lies about jury nullification from Sparf. After Prohibition began in 1920, juries began mass-acquitting defendants using jury nullification. The government anticipated that the righteous practice would become even more prevalent. To crush the People's exercise of their undeniable rights, government needed a way to re-try acquitted defendants despite the Double Jeopardy Clause. Voilà! Right on cue, the court conveniently engineered an unconstitutional fix.

In United States v. Lanza, 260 U.S. 377 (1922), it was first held that both a state (Washington) and the federal government can separately prosecute and cumulatively punish someone for the same alcohol "offense" – manufacturing, transporting, and possessing liquor. Multiple prosecutions for "the same offense" were reaffirmed in Palko v. Connecticut, 302 U.S. 319 (1937), which held that the Double Jeopardy Clause does not apply to the states because the protection is not "of the very essence of a scheme of ordered liberty." When Benton v. Maryland, 395 U.S. 784 (1969), overruled Palko and incorporated the Clause against the states, the court refused to honestly reconcile how two "sovereigns" together can overwhelm the "scheme" of liberty when neither can alone. Instead, it treated the 1922 betrayal of the Clause as a well-established technicality, lawful by default. Thereby, citizens are left defenseless against repeated government prosecutions.

GUNS, DRUGS,
& TAXES.
NO DRUGS
WARNING
DRUGS SOLD IN THIS PARK ARE OF INFERIOR QUALITY

GUNS, DRUGS, & TAXES

These are the big three laws of the United States government, each dishonestly crafted and judicially distorted to control and enslave the citizenry. All are firmly entrenched evil – as "interpreted" by the state. Ruling-class lies declared to be "law" – expressly designed to dominate, subjugate, and steal from the individual.

GUNS

The only actual gun law in the United States is the one that government refuses to enforce: **"shall not be infringed."**

Obeying the 2nd Amendment would eliminate problems, and help the lowly subjects reliably protect themselves – so the rulers ignore the English language. Government wants problems – it needs them to expand. The more the merrier.

The U.S. "supreme" court – in its infinite wisdom – has decided to let long-dead lawmakers become the judges and rulers of what the Second Amendment means today. N.Y. State Rifle & Pistol Ass'n v. Bruen, 597 U.S. 1 (2022) (entrusting Second Amendment rights to the "historical tradition" of Founding-era and Reconstruction lawmakers who routinely disarmed Catholics, African-Americans, and Native-Americans). Thus, the explicit phrase "shall not be infringed" is openly mocked by the court. That is the law – a disgrace – then and now. See, e.g., Dred Scott v. Sandford, 60 U.S. 393 (1857); Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 U.S. 537 (1896); Buck v. Bell, 274 U.S. 200 (1927); Korematsu v. United States, 323 U.S. 214 (1944); Stump v. Sparkman, 435 U.S. 349 (1978) (absolute judicial immunity allows "judges" to deploy state power to enforce slavery, uphold segregation, promote eugenics, intern racial groups, and secretly sterilize kids).

Prefatory clause:
A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State,
Operative clause:
the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

"The Second Amendment is naturally divided into two parts: its prefatory clause and its operative clause. The former does not limit the latter grammatically, but rather announces a purpose. . . . But apart from that clarifying function, a prefatory clause does not limit or expand the scope of the operative clause." District of Columbia v. Heller, 554 U.S. at 577–78.

The prefatory clause informs but cannot limit – that is the law – 5 to 4.
Four "justices" dissented, and claimed that the prefatory clause totally controls the operative clause, and transforms the "right of the people to keep and bear Arms" into a "collective right" not held by any individual. And the five in the majority ignored the operative clause anyway. That's authority. A joke.



Samuel Johnson's Dictionary

A

DICTIONARY

OF THE

ENGLISH LANGUAGE:

IN WHICH

The WORDS are deduced from their ORIGINALS,

By SAMUEL JOHNSON.

THE FOURTH EDITION, REVISED BY THE AUTHOR.

LONDON,

Printed by W. STRAHAN,

For W. STRAHAN, J. & F. RIVINGTON, T. DAVIES, J. HINTON, L. DAVIS; HAWES, CLARKE & COLLINS; W. JOHNSTON, W. OWEN, T. CASLON, S. CROWDER, T. LONGMAN, B. LAW, E. & C. DILLY, J. DODSLEY, Z. STUART, BECKET & DE HONDT, J. KNOX, T. CADELL, WILSON & NICOLL, W. NICOLL, G. ROBINSON, JO. JOHNSON, J. ROBSON, RICHARDSON & URQUHART, and M. HINGESTON.

MDCCLXXIII.

To INFRI'NGE. *v. a.* [*infringo*, Latin.]

1. To violate; to break laws or contracts.

Thoſe many had not dar'd to do that evil,
If the firſt man that did th' edict *infringe*,
Had anſwer'd for his deed. *Shakeſp. Meaſ. for Meaſ.*

Having *infring'd* the law, I wave my right
As king, and thus ſubmit myſelf to fight. *Waller.*

2. To deſtroy; to hinder.

Homilies, being plain and popular inſtructions, do not *infringe* the efficacy, although but read. *Hooker.*

Bright as the deathleſs gods and happy, ſhe
From all that may *infringe* delight is free. *Waller.*

ARMS. *n. ſ. without the ſingular number.* [*arma*, Lat.]

1. Weapons of offence, or armour of defence.

Thoſe *arms* which Mars before
Had giv'n the vanquiſh'd, now the victor bore. *Pope.*

2. A ſtate of hoſtility.

Sir Edward Courtney, and the haughty prelate,
With many more confed'rates, are in *arms*. *Shakeſpeare.*

3. War in general.

Arms and the man I ſing. *Dryden.*

Him Paris follow'd to the dire alarms,
Both breathing ſlaughter, both reſolv'd in *arms*. *Pope.*

4. Action; the act of taking arms.

Up roſe the victor angels, and to *arms*
The matin trumpet ſung. *Milton.*

And ſeas and rocks and ſkies rebound,
To arms, to arms, to arms. *Pope.*

5. The enſigns armorial of a family.

WEA'PON. *n. ſ.* [peapon, Saxon.] Inſtrument of offence; ſomething with which one is armed to hurt another.

"DRUGS"

The so-called "War on Drugs" is a war against the people of the United States. And also the Declaration of Independence. Every human being possesses the inherent unalienable right to **"Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness"** – rights that necessarily include dominion over your own body and mind. Drug laws obliterate that principle. They claim the state owns you completely in every respect, 24 hours a day, from birth to death. You're too stupid and dangerous to decide for yourself, and government permission is required to alter your consciousness. What you want as an individual is irrelevant, and probably illegal. Your bloodstream is a state testing ground, always open to inspection – and lawless vice cops are your daddy. The actual rule is just don't get caught. It is abject tyranny – accepted and even welcomed by the dim, downtrodden slaves.

The Constitution does not grant any power to criminalize possession or consumption of "drugs." Such a prohibition cannot be consistent with freedom and is directly opposite the true foundational Declaration of Independence. That parchment guarantees "Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness," and is far superior to the CONstitution, albeit itself statist. Government couldn't care less about either document, of course, fabricating all necessary "authority" through dishonest legislation, biased judicial interpretation, and bureaucratic fiat.

The result is mass incarceration, militarized policing, civil asset forfeiture, and the insane destruction of lives. It's all about government power and control – and all based on known and admitted lies. The "war" is the evil state against every individual – "drug" user or not – specifically designed to destroy freedom. The "drug war" empowers cartels by making their banned product more valuable. It also creates violence, further corrupts police, and grows big government, while extinguishing the most basic freedom of all: self-ownership of body and mind.

"FAIR" TAXATION

Taxation is theft. No law, custom, or tradition changes that fact. Neither does a vote. Taxation equals theft, both morally and logically. Using coercion to take another person's labor or property without their consent is extortion – and theft. No one is entitled to immunity from this rule. If an individual or group cannot steal from others through violence and threats, then the largest most powerful group cannot somehow "lawfully" claim for itself the only right to steal. The state has simply empowered itself by design. Force, violence, and lies are used to make up "laws" and call itself "government." Actually, it's just the biggest meanest gang operating today. By ruling-class logic, anyone can just declare themselves the supreme ruler at any time, and take whatever they want from anybody – without any real limitation. Rulers call that "crime" but it's actually just fair play under the real presiding rules. Numbers and superior firepower do not create legitimate moral "authority" or justify a monopoly on theft and violence. And calling a violent tyrannical lawless gang "government" doesn't change what it is.

THE "DRUG" WAR

"You want to know what this was really all about? The Nixon campaign in 1968, and the Nixon White House after that, had two enemies: the antiwar left and black people. You understand what I'm saying? We knew we couldn't make it illegal to be either against the war or black, but by getting the public to associate the hippies with Marijuana and blacks with heroin, and then criminalizing both heavily, we could disrupt those communities. We could arrest their leaders, raid their homes, break up their meetings, and vilify them night after night on the evening news.

Did we know we were lying about the drugs?

Of course we did."

–John Ehrlichman (1925–1999)
Assistant for Domestic Affairs to President Richard Nixon.
In 1994 – Confessing to their ongoing crimes against humanity.



BETTER PAY UP YO

IT'S FOR ROADS AND SHIT

SPARF

The chapter begins and ends with Sparf. Sparf is a blatant lie, three times over:

"Public and private safety alike would be in peril if the principle be established that juries in criminal cases may, of right, disregard the law as expounded to them by the court, and become a law unto themselves."

Sparf & Hansen v. United States, 156 U.S. at 101 (1895) (censoring the truth).

1. Jury nullification was already, and remains, a legal right – by definition.
2. Jury nullification was already an established legal right – since 1670.
3. "Public and private safety" was never "in peril" due to jury nullification, despite it being an established legal right for the previous 225 years.

You would have to be stupid to believe Sparf's pathetic "judicial" words, which are obvious lies specifically designed to circumvent your undeniable rights. Government doesn't even try to hide its nonsense, always relying on "safety" to dupe its ignorant slaves. In this case, it created lawless censorship "law" based upon semantics and lies to best ensure ignorance would prevail. But really, it's not an open question – the "supreme" court is lying. Reality speaks for itself. The state's "safety" lies are just shackles for fools who trust judges. Becoming "a law unto themselves" is simply the jury exercising its long-established legal rights.

In 1895's Sparf, not even the dissent mentioned the historically recent 1850s Fugitive Slave cases. This was an outrageous lie of omission. Jury nullification played a major role in restoring human dignity, and ending chattel slavery. This was done against the "law" and contrary to express judicial dictates of the time. But the entire court stayed silent about slavery. The majority falsely declared that jury nullification would imperil safety, and the dissent refused to counter with an obvious slam dunk. Neither faction of the government's highest court wanted to admit in writing that the court is always in favor of slavery – the law is the law.

"You can resolve to live your life with integrity. Let your credo be this: Let the lie come into the world, let it even triumph. But not through me."

-Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn (1918–2008)
Russian dissident. "Live Not By Lies," *Washington Post*, February 12, 1974.

4. JUDGES

"The state calls its own violence law, but that of the individual crime."

-Max Stirner (1806-1856)
German philosopher and individualist anarchist.

"A belligerent state permits itself every such misdeed, every such act of violence, as would disgrace the individual."

-Sigmund Freud (1856-1939)
Austrian neurologist and the founder of psychoanalysis.

"Government is an association of men who do violence to the rest of us."

-Leo Tolstoy (1828-1910)
Russian writer and Christian anarchist.

LVL

“In the days when the judges ruled, there was a famine in the land.”

-Ruth 1:1 (ESV)

We do not have
Obama judges or Trump judges,
Bush judges or Clinton judges.
What we have is an extraordinary group of dedicated judges doing their level best to do equal right to those appearing before them. That independent judiciary is something we should all be thankful for.
BULLSHITTER
BULLSHIT
BUSH JUDGE
"justice" Roberts
LVL

I would hope that a wise Latina woman with the richness of her experiences would more often than not reach a better conclusion than a white male who hasn't lived that life.
I do not believe that any racial, ethnic or gender group has an advantage in sound judging. I do believe every person has an equal opportunity to be a good and wise judge, regardless of their background or life experiences.
2002
RACIST
OBAMA JUDGE
LIAR
2009
"justice" Sotomayor
LVL

STOOGE
CORPORATE ENABLER
CORPORATE HACK
D.E.I.
RACIST
THIEF
CHIEF LIAR
CORPORATE THEOCRAT
LACKEY
TRUTH
LIES
LVL

"A politician divides mankind into two classes: tools and enemies."

-The Truth

Judges are traders in lies – paid liars – and the ultimate tool of the government.

You are the enemy.

Judges are out to get you. And exalt themselves. Just like politicians, the police, tax collectors, the jailers, and other traders in state lies. They are your rulers.

They own you – body and soul. That is the law.

"Each person must think and emote good feelings to others."

Hawaii Rev. Stat. § 5-7.5 "Aloha Spirit" (1986) (used to deny 2nd Amendment rights).

"The basic function of government everywhere in all times, whatever title it adopts and whatever its origin and organisation may be, is always that of oppressing and exploiting the masses, of defending the oppressors and the exploiters: and its principal, characteristic and indispensable, instruments are the police agent and the tax-collector, the soldier and the gaoler – to whom must be invariably added the trader in lies, be he priest or schoolmaster, remunerated or protected by the government to enslave minds and make them docilely accept the yoke."

-Errico Malatesta (1853–1932)
Italian philosopher and anarcho-communist.

Judges are well-paid state-run tools, and career defenders of state authority. Their lies usually build upon and are "justified" by documented lies of the past, but they'll make up new whoppers too, and protect each other, and routinely omit anything contrary or inconvenient. Whatever it takes. First and foremost, judges love exercising power, and are not afraid to steal it any way they can. Then wield it violently for the benefit of the ruling class. That's the "judicial" system.

Judges tried to steal rights from juries with the lies and censorship of Sparf. Weak semantics was all they could muster to try and take over the jury system for themselves. Unenforceable nonsense on its face, "supported" only by violently enforced ignorance and rejection of logic. But it has mostly worked, so far, and of course they tried. Why not? Lawyers and judges "police" themselves just like the police pretend to police themselves. Not at all. They run the show. Through this bogus yet accepted aristocrat design, the ruling class gets away with anything and everything – even when they're caught outright and obviously blatantly lying.

Despite its pedestrian lies, rejection of logic, and reliance upon docile ignorance, Sparf has actually worked exceptionally well for the ruling class. Nevertheless, the subjects can never be trusted. Judges would eliminate juries entirely if they could – in a heartbeat. They don't need the headache, and are committed to taking all the power they possibly can – since 1803. The proof is that judges have already unconstitutionally eliminated the vast majority of juries by lawlessly declaring six months of incarceration a "petty" matter good only for a bench trial. Plus, every plea "bargain" is actually a back-room ruling-class elimination of yet another "citizen" jury. Ultimately, extreme elimination[2] of juries is much more efficient and effective for the rulers than just lying to the jury and hoping they stay stupid and submissive forever. Sparf v. United States. And the jury system lies in ruins.

Sixth Amendment (*emphasis added*)

> ***In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury*** **of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defence.**

2

Offense Category	Defendants Disposed Of	Total Convicted (All)	Conviction Rate	Total Jury Trials	Jury Acquittals (% of Jury Trials)	Jury Trial Rate	Not Convicted (All)	Non-Conviction Rate
All Federal Offenses	82,042	76,514	93.3%	1,324	135(10.2%)	1.6%	5,528	6.7%
Firearms Offenses	9,664	9,052	93.7%	239	36(15.1%)	2.5%	612	6.3%
Drug Offenses	17,652	16,283	92.2%	309	19(6.1%)	1.8%	1,369	7.8%
Tax Offenses	327	307	93.9%	12	2(16.7%)	3.7%	20	6.1%

U.S. Federal Criminal Case Dispositions — Fiscal Year 2025
United States District Courts — Criminal Defendants Disposed Of
12-Month Period Ending September 30, 2025 (AOUSC Table D-4)

Methodological Note: This chart is based on Administrative Office Table D-4 (U.S. district courts) for the 12-month period ending September 30, 2025. It includes all "serious" federal offenses — felonies and Class A misdemeanors — and excludes all "petty" offenses. The data are defendant-based, not charge-based: each defendant is counted once regardless of the number of charges filed. Offense category is determined by the most serious offense of conviction. A conviction on *any* count = convicted. Accordingly, the table does not reflect the total number of charges filed or charge-level conviction or acquittal rates.



In Duncan v. Louisiana, 391 U.S. 145 (1968), the supreme court finally claimed to "incorporate" the Sixth Amendment jury-trial right against the states. It held that "trial by jury in criminal cases is fundamental to the American scheme of justice." But the fundamental right had already been officially shrunk for the benefit of the federal government – since the Gilded Age. Callan v. Wilson, 127 U.S. 540 (1888). The United States Constitution is just words on parchment, after all. In Duncan, the Court again ignored those words and held that only "serious" state criminal prosecutions require a jury, not "all" criminal prosecutions like the document actually says. "Petty" offenses were again excluded from the merely apparent constitutional guarantee. Then, in Baldwin v. New York, 399 U.S. 66 (1970), a bright-line rule was invented. The Court defined "serious" as any offense punishable by more than six months of incarceration. Six months or less, *in jail*, is now presumed to be a "petty" matter, and the government may deny a jury entirely. The United States Constitution contains no such classification. It says: "In all criminal prosecutions."

The rejection of the actual written meaning of the words in the Constitution officially transformed the U.S. jury-trial right (*and the right to bear Arms*) from a written constitutional guarantee into a ruling-class-defined privilege. And it is thereby always subject to further judicial infringement at government's whim. Legislatures may now structure "criminal" statutes to avoid jury trials altogether by simply capping sentences at six months. Or someday more. Combined with the modern plea system where prosecutors overcharge "crimes" and threaten much greater punishment to induce waiver of rights – the consequence is explicitly built into the design. The eviscerated "right" now exists at the pleasure of the ruling class – who lawlessly define and endlessly explore its unwritten limits.

Your unalienable rights and supposedly-declared freedoms mean nothing to "judges" and lawyers. Any granted benefits are just words on parchment – to be superseded at will. Your desire for happiness is anathema to the ruling class. They specifically chose their business to control you and violate you. For profit.

They are parasites. They are aristocratic tools.

You are the enemy.

"The first thing we do, let's kill all the lawyers."

-Dick the Butcher
William Shakespeare, *Henry VI, Part 2*, Act IV, Scene II.

"A portion of the tastes and of the habits of the aristocracy may consequently be discovered in the characters of men in the profession of the law. They participate in the same instinctive love of order and of formalities; and they entertain the same repugnance to the actions of the multitude, and the same secret contempt of the government of the people."

-Alexis de Tocqueville (1805–1859)
French aristocrat – praising American lawyers and judges.
Democracy in America. Volume I, Chapter XVI (1835).

THE ULTIMATE EXAMPLE
OF
RULING-CLASS ATTITUDE & ACTION

In November 1994, Nevada voters crushed "Question 3" – a proposed constitutional amendment to allow mid-term salary increases for Nevada supreme court "justices" and district court judges. The ballot question asked:

"Shall the Nevada Constitution be amended to allow an increase in the salaries of Justices of the Supreme Court and District Court Judges during their terms of office?"

It was an unprecedented landslide:

NO = 309,137 = 84%

YES = 58,363 = 16%

The vote was more than 5-to-1 *AGAINST* the judges' demanded mid-term pay raises. The voters had spoken – loudly. The Nevada state constitution explicitly prohibited such raises during a judge's term as a safeguard against corruption. Nev. Const. Art. 6, § 15. The People made it quite clear they didn't want change. The "winning" vote was NO, overwhelmingly, by far, but the spoiled aristocrat judiciary refused to accept the desires of the ignorant masses. Seven years later, the Nevada legislature made it crystal clear who is really in charge.

YES – it's the ruling class.

LAS VEGAS SUN

Ignoring voters and Constitution

Mike O'Callaghan

…While the people of Boulder City were watching the store, their legislators in Carson City were participating in a political scam that has been in the political sausage grinder for years. What the 2001 Legislature accomplished was to spit in the eyes of Nevadans by subverting their expressed will and the Nevada Constitution.

The story began back in 1970 when voters answered the pleas of District Court judges and justices of the Nevada Supreme Court and extended their terms of office from four to six years. This was the right thing to do, but within the next two decades the beneficiaries of the term extension began to complain about waiting six years for pay raises. So they played illicit games of hiding money to be paid for "additional duties." These dollars were made available to justices who didn't benefit immediately from pay raises. It is, according to the Nevada Constitution, required that elected state officials must face the voters again before getting a pay increase. This requirement was being ignored by both the legislators and justices.

Then the justices and judges went to the Legislature to get a Joint Resolution passed that proposed to amend the state Constitution and allow increases in salaries of justices and judges during their terms in office.

Nevada voters answered with 309,137 no votes to 58,363 yes votes. The justices, judges and legislators had their question answered.

Less than seven years ago, in the 1994 general election, the state's voters got a crack at the request. Question No. 3 asked, "Shall the Nevada Constitution be amended to allow an increase in the salaries of justices of the Supreme Court and District Court judges during their term of office?" Nevada voters answered with 309,137 NO votes to 58,363 YES votes. The justices, judges and legislators had their question answered.

Not being easily persuaded, some of the justices went back to the old game of special "extra duty" payments. That's when the court's conscience, then-Chief Justice Tom Steffen, told them it was unconstitutional.

During the 2001 Nevada Legislature the justices and judges went back to their legislative pals, some of them lawyers, for help in getting around the state's Constitution and the will of the people. Two justices and one Las Vegas District Court judge spent more time in the Legislature this spring than they did in their offices or on the bench. = Real PRIORITIES

The Ruling Cla$$

From their efforts came Senate Bill 184, which says that certain justices shall be appointed to "the Supreme Court commission on law libraries" and be entitled to receive $32,400 yearly above their base salaries. The recipients of the extra dollars would be those who don't become eligible for pay increases granted by the Legislature because they don't face the voters for another few years. The same arrangement is made for some District Court judges.

Very simply, the Legislature has, along with the state's judicial system, created a scam to get around the will of the people and the state Constitution. …

Now it's time for every Nevadan to ask their legislators why they treated the Nevada Constitution so shabbily. Why didn't they send the justices and judges back to the voters for a constitutional change? Because they knew that such a change isn't what Nevadans want or would approve. Now it's on the governor's desk.

Voters, your legislators sent you a message. Did you get it?

Mike O'Callaghan *is the Las Vegas Sun executive editor.*

LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL Las Vegas Review-Journal

EQUALIZING PAY

Creation of panel under fire

Critics upset that justices earn extra money sitting on Law Libraries commission

By SEAN WHALEY
REVIEW-JOURNAL CAPITAL BUREAU

CARSON CITY — A commission created by the Legislature in 2001 to equalize Supreme Court justices' pay is another example of how the court is playing fast and loose with the state constitution, critics say.

Legislation created the Supreme Court Commission on Law Libraries, which was given the task of improving public access to the law and legal publications, and boosted justices' pay to $140,000 from $107,600.

The legislation authorized justices who cannot receive the higher salary until they are re-elected to collect extra pay by serving on the commission. The state constitution requires a justice to be re-elected before receiving the higher pay.

Critics say the extra pay violates the intent of the state constitution. …

"This just proves my point that this is a court run amok. They are running outside the parameters of what the people of the state of Nevada want."

GEORGE HARRIS
CHAIRMAN OF THE NEVADA REPUBLICAN LIBERTY CAUCUS

LVL Guinn 6 $833 million theft

Justice Robert Rose, committee minutes show, said the inequity was an "absurd situation" not intended by the drafters of the constitution, and payment for service on the commission was an appropriate way to resolve the problem.

Service on the commission pays $32,400 a year, the precise difference in the salaries among some justices. The five justices receiving the lower pay are the ones who serve on the commission: Rose, Chief Justice Deborah Agosti and Justices Miriam Shearing, Nancy Becker and Myron Leavitt. …

Harris and other critics say it is another example of the high court ignoring the constitution. The other example they cite is the court's 6-1 tax vote in July. That ruling, which is back before the court for possible reconsideration, said the constitutional requirement for a two-thirds vote in the Legislature to raise taxes did not have to be followed in the recently concluded special session. …

Knight Allen, a citizen activist who has monitored government salary issues for several years, also criticized the practice of equalizing the pay.

"They operate on the fundamental assumption they can make the rules," he said of the court. "If the constitution gets in the way of what they want, they will figure out a way around it." …

The 2001 Supreme Court pay legislation was approved unanimously in the Senate and with only six no votes in the Assembly. The 30 percent pay increase to $140,000 was the first for members of the court since a lawmaker-approved increase in 1995.

Because justices' six-year terms are staggered, however, the pay increase did not take effect immediately for all seven members of the court. The constitution requires justices to be re-elected before they can receive the higher pay. …

LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL … DNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 3, 2003

Opinion

and …mentary

EDITORIALS

Constitutional end run

How convenient.

Pay for judicial commissions further undermines the intent of the document

As if the 6-1 decision by the Nevada Supreme Court setting aside the Gibbons Tax Restraint Initiative weren't insult enough, the justices have added further injury to Silver State taxpayers by pocketing outside compensation intended precisely to circumvent the intent of the state constitution.

The state constitution prohibits office holders from receiving any increase in compensation without first facing the voters. So when the 2001 Legislature approved a 30 percent salary hike for the justices, only those justices elected or re-elected in 2002 qualified immediately for the higher pay.

The members of the court are again showing a callous disregard for the plain language of the law, let alone its spirit.

When five of the seven justices complained that they would not qualify for the salary increase until after their next election campaigns, lawmakers should have said, "Tough." Instead, with barely a whimper of opposition, the Legislature created the Supreme Court Commission on Law Libraries … and compensated the five justices who sit on it and its various adjuncts an amount that's equal to the pay hike their colleagues who faced the voters in 2002 were awarded.

All this after it was declared unconstitutional in the early 1990s for the justices to try a similar ploy to pad their pay, that time through service on the Pardons Board and the Board of Law Library Trustees.

The justices continue to protest that the commission performs a valuable service, by making official legal forms more user-friendly and clarifying the duties clerks and law librarians can legitimately perform for the public.

That may be true. But if so, the justices could certainly provide their expertise pro bono, rather than pocket tidy paychecks of questionable legality at taxpayer expense.

Two years ago, we argued that the magnitude of the salary increase was way out of line, and that compensating the justices for serving on the law library commission was nothing more than an end run around the the concise language of the state constitution regarding eligibility for higher pay — which was approved by voters in both 1966 and 1968. Both admonitions stand.

But there's a deeper problem here, which was underscored by the court's July decision in Guinn v. Legislature. The justices "operate on the fundamental assumption they can make the rules," noted local activist Knight Allen. "If the constitution gets in the way of what they want, they will figure out a way around it."

The members of the court are again showing a callous disregard for the plain language of the law, let alone its spirit.

Such a cavalier attitude toward the constitution and the restraints it allegedly places on government might be no surprise, given the thorough shredding the justices gave that document two months ago. But it's nevertheless a resounding disappointment.

In 2001, the Nevada legislature circumvented both the Nevada Constitution and 84% of Nevada voters by creating two fake commissions. The “Supreme Court Commission on Law Libraries” and the “District Court Commission on Law Libraries” were invented to pay all of the ruling-class tools the unconstitutional cash that they specifically were not entitled to, and specifically could not receive under the law. Senate Bill 184 passed the Nevada Senate 21–0 and the Nevada Assembly 36–6. Senate Bill 184 was signed into “law” on June 15, 2001 by Republican governor Kenny Guinn.

“The work of the judges on these Commissions is not just a façade to achieve pay equity.”

-T. Arthur Ritchie, Jr. – 2007 – Lying to the Nevada legislature while trying to extend $cheme. “Untouchable” Nevada Judge – Eighth Judicial District, Family Court Division, Clark County.

The fake commissions paid the lying undeserving money-grubbing complicit judges and “justices” the *exact* raise amount that they had been properly and lawfully denied by the Nevada Constitution and the Nevada voters. Imagine that. Voilà!

Rules don't apply to the ruling class. By definition. That is the law.

The ruling class simply ignored the overwhelming “NO” from the mere people and engineered a slimy backdoor workaround to line their own pockets and further empower themselves against the People they profit from, rule over, and dominate while openly treating them with contempt. The near-unanimous in-your-face legislative maneuver exemplifies political “integrity” in the United States of America. It is the government unashamedly gorging itself. The hideous scheme exposes exactly why the propped-up well-paid black-robed judicial bandits deserve extreme contempt and justified retribution at every branch and every level every minute of every day – until the bitter end.

Just because they sit on a bench intentionally elevated far above everyone else, and are violently exercising fake authority against you, and wear costumes to justify their vile daily rapes, doesn't mean that judges themselves are actually exempt from reality. They think they are, and act like they are, but really, judges have the same legitimate authority over you that you have over them. None whatsoever. Your violence against them has the identical justification as their violence against you. Smaller gangs can enforce their own draconian rules too. Even a lone wolf. Numbers and superior firepower mean nothing if you execute against your enemy properly. You just have to stand up for yourself. Plan well. And execute.

By ruling-class logic, I could sentence all the judges in the entire United States to death because I don't like what they do. And hire someone to kill them.

What is the most illuminating takeaway from the fake commissions story?

It is aristocrat Ron D. Parraguirre – and his aristocrat wife Leslie Parraguirre. Ron Parraguirre is a fourth-generation Nevadan and a second-generation judge. He graduated from the University of San Diego law school, and after graduation he went to work in Washington, D.C. for former Republican Nevada governor and then United States Senator Paul Laxalt. Parraguirre was appointed to the Clark County district court bench in 1999 by governor Kenny Guinn after having been elected a Las Vegas municipal court judge in 1991 with 14,151 votes, 54%–46%. His vote total was less than 5% of the city's population at the time – 298,321.

In 2025, Ron D. Parraguirre is a sitting Nevada supreme court "justice" and three-time recipient of "Law Library Commission" funds – 2003, 2004, and 2010. In 2009, he and "justice" James Hardesty tried to act noble, and Hardesty announced that they both were foregoing the $30,000 fake job in order to assist with state budget difficulties: "These were personal decisions we made. The others have every right to be appointed to the commission and accept the pay." The next year they both quietly took "their" unearned unconstitutional cash without broadcasting their personal decision to take it.

Back in 2006, Parraguirre and Hardesty had also teamed up, joining with three of their dishonest cohorts (Nancy Becker, Mark Gibbons, and Michael Douglas) to blatantly violate the United States Constitution for the express benefit of the City of Las Vegas – Parraguirre's previous employer. They all disgracefully displayed their unwavering allegiance to the lawbreaking and always-proud-of-it Sin City. They had to pay their dues to the ruling class. It was their despicable duty. They declared an obviously unconstitutional Las Vegas lap-dance ordinance constitutional and lawlessly overruled the decisions of two lower court judges. City of Las Vegas v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court (Krampe), 122 Nev. 1041 (2006).

How'd they get away with it? The five "justices" in the 5–2 ruling completely ignored the actual definition of "Fondle or caress" expressly contained in the Las Vegas ordinance. They pretended like the definition didn't exist and adopted a completely different definition from a Washington state case that had completely different rules – including a 10-foot distance requirement for all erotic dances. And key – the cases were dropped and they covertly ordered the Las Vegas Metro police to never again try to enforce the obviously unconstitutional ordinance. They all conspired together, blatantly broke the law, covered up everything for each other, and everybody got away with everything. That is the ruling class.

Of which judge Ron and wife Leslie Parraguirre are benefits-receiving members.

A little after 9 p.m. on October 30, 2015, Leslie Parraguirre committed a gross misdemeanor anti-Latino hate crime battery. NRS 200.481 (battery); NRS 207.185 (hate crime enhancement). But because she is a member of the ruling class, Leslie Parraguirre received special treatment and no punishment whatsoever for the violent crime she committed against Oliver Gomez-Baez. You be the judge:

Nevada with Business and Opinion

Inside
Obituaries, 4B
Opinion, 5B
Business, 6B

Supreme Court justice's wife facing trial on DUI charge

By CARRI GEER THEVENOT
LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL

Leslie Parraguirre, the wife of Nevada Supreme Court Justice Ron Parraguirre, is facing an April trial on a misdemeanor DUI charge.

Her attorney, Richard Wright, said she was arrested in late October after a minor traffic collision on West Charleston Boulevard in the Summerlin area.

"She's embarrassed and deeply regrets the situation," Wright said late Wednesday.

The attorney said she was driving alone the evening of her arrest. He said she was arrested on two misdemeanors, DUI and battery, but Las Vegas Justice Court's online records show that the latter charge was dismissed on Feb. 4 after the state chose not to proceed.

Wright declined to comment on the battery charge.

Online records for the DUI case

▶ See PARRAGUIRRE, Page 4B

▶ PARRAGUIRRE

Continued from Page 1B

start on Oct. 30 with a "temporary custody record" and show an "own recognizance release" on Oct. 31.

A criminal complaint was filed Dec. 15 but could not be obtained late Wednesday. The case lists a second misdemeanor charge of failing to "decrease speed or use due care."

According to the online records, a plea of not guilty was entered Feb. 1, and a bench trial has been scheduled for April 7 before Justice of the Peace Karen Bennett-Haron.

Wright said he has not appeared in court on the matter with his client.

"The case is being handled by the district attorney's office just like any other case, and we will continue to address it appropriately," the lawyer said. . . .

Nevada with Business and Opinion

Inside
Obituaries, 4B
Opinion, 8B
Business, 10B

CITY DESK • 702-383-0249 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL • FRIDAY, MARCH 11, 2016 a SECTION B

Justice's wife attacked man after wreck

District attorney said office lacked evidence to prosecute

By CARRI GEER THEVENOT
LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL

A battery citation indicates that Leslie Parraguirre, wife of Nevada Supreme Court Justice Ron Parraguirre, punched a man in the face and kicked him after a traffic collision that led to her October arrest on a DUI charge.

On Thursday, District Attorney Steve Wolfson said his office had insufficient evidence to prosecute the battery charge, which was dismissed in February.



Leslie Parraguirre
Punched and kicked Oliver Gomez-Baez, according to a battery citation

"We requested the officer's report and never received it," Wolfson said.

Las Vegas police spokesman Jesse Roybal said officer's reports are not routinely prepared, and he could not find one in the battery case.

Roybal said a crime report was taken for a battery, but he could not immediately determine whether it was provided to the district attorney's office. The Las Vegas Review-Journal requested a copy of the report Thursday but did not receive a response before the end of Metro's business day.

Wolfson said he considers Ron Parraguirre a friend but has never discussed the case with him.

"I think that Justice Parraguirre is an honorable and ethical judge, and he knows the rules of ethics, and it would be inappropriate for him to make that phone call," Wolfson said.

He also said the prosecutor who screened the case did not discuss the battery charge with him before declining to pursue it.

"I was consulted on the DUI case," said Wolfson, calling it "the more serious case."

Leslie Parraguirre, 57, of Las Vegas was arrested Oct. 30.

"She's embarrassed and deeply regrets the situation," defense attorney Richard

▶ See PARRAGUIRRE, Page 4B

▶ PARRAGUIRRE

Continued from Page 1B

Wright said Wednesday. He has declined to comment on the battery allegations.

A criminal complaint, filed Dec. 15, charges Leslie Parraguirre with two misdemeanors: drunken driving and failing to decrease speed to avoid a collision. A bench trial is scheduled for April 7 before Las Vegas Justice of the Peace Karen Bennett-Haron.

A battery citation, obtained Thursday from the Las Vegas Justice Court clerk's office, indicates that the violation occurred shortly after 9 p.m. on Oct. 30 at Charleston Boulevard and Indigo Drive, the same location listed under the two charges in the criminal complaint.

The citation indicates that Leslie Parraguirre was driving a sport utility vehicle and "had been drinking."

According to the citation, she willfully and unlawfully used force and violence on Oliver Gomez-Baez by punching him "once in the face" and kicking him once.

"Without the officer's report, it's difficult for us to move forward on the battery charge," Wolfson said.

The officer listed on the citation is Jake Grunwald. The word "refused," in all capital letters, appears on the defendant's signature line.

According to the criminal complaint, Leslie Parraguirre failed "to decrease speed when necessary to avoid a collision with Maria Presa, and/or Oliver Gomez Baez" on Oct. 30.

Attempts to reach Presa and Gomez-Baez on Thursday were not successful.

Wolfson said he has met Leslie Parraguirre, who operates an interior design company in Las Vegas, "a few times over the years."

Ron Parraguirre, a former Las Vegas municipal judge and Clark County district judge, joined the high court in 2004.

Contact reporter Carri Geer Thevenot at cgeer@reviewjournal.com or 702-384-8710. Find her on Twitter: @CarriGeer

"Without the officer's report, it's difficult for us to move forward on the battery charge."
STEVE WOLFSON
DISTRICT ATTORNEY

Judge's wife pleads no contest to DUI charge

Parraguirre's case closed following plea, records show

By CARRI GEER THEVENOT
LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL



Leslie Parraguirre Wife of Nevada Supreme Court Justice Ron Parraguirre pleaded no contest to a DUI charge March 30

The wife of Nevada Supreme Court Justice Ron Parraguirre pleaded no contest to a misdemeanor DUI charge rather than go to trial, records show.

Leslie Parraguirre, 57, entered the plea March 30 before Las Vegas Justice of the Peace Karen Bennett-Haron and was adjudged guilty. Prosecutors agreed not to pursue a related battery charge.

Records show that she was sentenced to two days in jail with two days of "credit for time served." She also paid a $685 fine and attended DUI school and a "victim impact panel," with victims of DUI crashes who speak about the affect the crash has had on their lives.

The case was closed the day of the plea with a notation that the requirements had been completed. A related speeding charge was dismissed.

"It was handled exactly like every other misdemeanor DUI case that comes through that courtroom," Chief Deputy District Attorney Brian Rutledge said.

Parraguirre's attorney, Richard Wright, declined to comment.

Records show Las Vegas police responded to a traffic collision shortly after 9 p.m. on Oct 30 at Charleston Boulevard and Indigo Drive. Parraguirre's SUV had rear-ended a vehicle stopped behind another vehicle at a red light.

According to a crime report, Oliver Gomez-Baez, 25, was driving the other vehicle. He approached Parraguirre's vehicle after the crash and opened the door to make contact with her.

"Gomez-Baez stated that Parraguirre was immediately verbally aggressive and argumentative," the report states. "While yelling at him, Parraguirre was said to be using racial slurs. Gomez-Baez stated that he was afraid Parraguirre would try to leave the scene so he stayed at her door. Parraguirre continued to yell and get out of the vehicle. Parraguirre then used a closed, right fist to punch Gomez-Baez on the left side of his mouth. Parraguirre then kicked Gomez-Baez in the left shin."

According to a separate "impaired driving report," Parraguirre was sitting in an ambulance when police arrived. She "admitted to being at a dinner party and states that she only had one alcoholic beverage," according to the report.

During field sobriety tests she "became argumentative, uncooperative and verbally abusive toward officers."

She was handcuffed and taken to the Clark County Detention Center. Records show she was released the following day on her own recognizance.

Last month, District Attorney Steve Wolfson said his office had insufficient evidence to prosecute the misdemeanor battery charge, which was dismissed in February.

Gomez-Baez provided the Las Vegas Review-Journal with photos from the night of the incident that show a minor cut around his lip.

"She got me with her ring," he said in Spanish.

He said he believes the battery charge was dropped because of Ron Parraguirre's influence.

Gomez-Baez said Leslie Parraguirre was shouting to everyone after the crash, "Call my husband."

Leslie Parraguirre operates an interior design company in Las Vegas. Ron Parraguirre, a former Las Vegas municipal judge and Clark County district judge, joined the state's high court in 2004.

Contact Carri Geer Thevenot at cgeer@reviewjournal.com or 702-384-8710. Find @CarriGeer on Twitter.

Reporter Alex Corey contributed to this report.

Gomez-Baez said Leslie Parraguirre was shouting to everyone after the crash:

"CALL MY HUSBAND."

NEVADA WITH BUSINESS AND OPINION

Laxalt appeals injunction

Attorney General Adam Laxalt filed an appeal to overturn a judge's injunction on controversial education savings accounts. **B2**

Inside

Obituaries, **B4**
Opinion, **B9**
Business, **B10**

Questions? Contact editor James G. Wright at 702-383-0249

FEDERAL LAWSUIT

Woman: Money wrongfully transferred

Lawsuit includes wife of Nevada justice

By Carri Geer Thevenot
Las Vegas Review-Journal

A California woman claims her former bookkeeper wrongfully transferred more than $180,000 from her bank accounts to Leslie Parraguirre, who is married to Nevada Supreme Court Justice Ron Parraguirre, and Leslie Parraguirre's interior design company.

Tonia Antonacci made the allegation in a federal lawsuit she filed in November 2014 against the bookkeeper, Roxanne Sparks; Leslie Parraguirre; and Leslie Parraguirre's design firm, Colours Inc. She filed the complaint as an individual and as trustee of the Toni Antonacci Family Trust.

"Although Parraguirre and Colours have acknowledged that Sparks acted wrongfully and have fully acknowledged that the transfers benefiting them have occurred, they have refused to reimburse Antonacci and the trustee and have and continue to retain all benefits from the said wrongful transfers," the lawsuit alleges.

Parraguirre

In a telephone interview Friday, Sparks admitted she made the wrongful transfers.

"I admit that I did it," she told the Las Vegas Review-Journal. "I was going to pay the money back. Things just happened."

The Las Vegas woman said she took no money for herself. All of it went to Colours Inc., she said.

"I was trying to save the Parraguirre company and save everyone's jobs," Sparks said.

SEE LAWSUIT, B4

Leslie Parraguirre, wife of Nevada Supreme Court Justice Ron Parraguirre, operates her design firm, Colours Inc., in this building at 500 S. Seventh St.
CARRI GEER/LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL

Ex-bookkeeper faces 49 theft, forgery charges

Woman, 57, accused of shifting $200,000 between accounts

By KIMBER LAUX
LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL

A former bookkeeper accused of transferring more than $200,000 between two of her clients' accounts over a four-year period is facing 49 charges of theft and forgery, according to court documents.

Between January 2010 and December 2014, Roxanne "Roxie" Sparks, 57, was working as a bookkeeper for both Leslie Parraguirre, the wife of Nevada Supreme Court Justice Ron Parraguirre, and a California woman, Toni Antonacci, when she transferred money from Antonacci's accounts to Leslie Parraguirre's business accounts without authorization, the woman's criminal complaint reads.

The complaint, filed July 29 in Las Vegas Justice Court, alleges Sparks used Antonacci's signature stamp to write unauthorized checks, made unauthorized cash transfers and used Antonacci's Office Depot card to take $201,096.22 from Antonacci's accounts and move it to Parraguirre's.

"I believe that Roxie fully intended to pay me back," Antonacci said Friday, adding that Sparks did pay her back about $7,500. "All I want is money back, and I know she doesn't have it. Leslie Parraguirre does."

Sparks also is accused of using Parraguirre's credit card and forged her credit card statements, adjusting the balance on paper by up to $20,000. On seven occasions, Sparks gave Parraguirre, the owner of Colours Inc., an interior design business that hired her as its bookkeeper in 2006, forged statements that showed differences in account balances totaling $101,517, the complaint claims.

Sparks was arrested Wednesday and is being held at the Clark County Detention Center on $197,000 bail. Her preliminary hearing is scheduled for 9 a.m. Aug. 18. Sparks' attorney could not be reached for comment.

Antonacci filed a federal lawsuit in 2014, demanding $180,000 for money traded from her account to Colours Inc. Sparks, Colours Inc. and Parraguirre are listed as defendants in the ongoing case, which seeks "the return of monies wrongfully taken" from her accounts.

"As far as I'm concerned, Leslie Parraguirre should be in jail for receipt of stolen goods," Antonacci said, "and I'd certainly like to know why the DA's office hasn't had her arrested."

Attorneys for Parraguirre declined to comment. However, in a civil lawsuit filed April 29 in Clark County District Court, Parraguirre argued that Sparks admitted to manipulating her company and personal accounts.

"After Sparks' unexpected departure from Colours, Sparks admitted to certain fraud and illegal activity," including transferring money from third-party accounts into Colours' accounts, drawing unauthorized checks from third party accounts, making unauthorized transfers between Colours' accounts and maxing out the company's credit cards, the civil complaint reads.

The civil lawsuit filed by Parraguirre and Colours Inc., refers to Sparks' employment with the company, but doesn't list her as a defendant.

Parraguirre accuses Nyberg and Associates, Colours' accounting firm at the time of the thefts, the firm's owner, James Nyberg, and its employee, Daniel Geiger, of professional negligence, breach of contract, negligent misrepresentation, negligent hiring and supervision and breach of fiduciary duty. In the civil complaint, Parraguirre argues that in 2007, her company and Nyberg and Associates agreed that Geiger, a convicted felon, would not handle her or her business' accounts.

"Unbeknownst to Parraguirre, Geiger, at the direction of Nyberg, continued to perform financial and tax-related services to Colours" and failed to identify red flags in financial records, the complaint reads.

Contact Kimber Laux at klaux@reviewjournal.com or 702-383-0283. Find @lauxkimber on Twitter.

Nevada with Business and Opinion

CITY DESK • 702-383-0249 LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL • WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 26, 2016 SECTION B

Inside

Obituaries, 4B
Business, 5B
Opinion, 8B

Ex-bookkeeper sentenced

Judge imposes up to 10 years in prison for theft of $200K

By DAVID FERRARA
LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL

A former Las Vegas bookkeeper was ordered to serve four to 10 years in prison Tuesday for illegally transferring more than $200,000 between two companies, including one owned by the wife of a Nevada Supreme Court justice.

Leslie Parraguirre wept before District Judge Michael Villani as she described how Roxanne "Roxie" Sparks used a credit card for Parraguirre's interior design business and forged statements for more than $20,000, which she claimed resulted in more than $1.5 million worth of "collateral damage."

Sparks, 57, initially faced 49 counts of theft and forgery. In August, as part of an agreement with prosecutors, she pleaded guilty to two counts of theft and one count of forgery.

But a California woman whom prosecutors also consider a victim told the judge that Sparks intended to pay back the money and said the former bookkeeper should be spared from a prison sentence.

Toni Antonacci, who has filed a federal lawsuit against Parraguirre, was interrupted several times by Villani and a prosecutor when she accused Parraguirre of collecting the more than $200,000 that Sparks transferred from Antonacci's business to Colours Inc., owned by Parraguirre and her husband, the high court's Chief Justice Ron Parraguirre.

The justice sat in the back row of the gallery during Tuesday's hearing.

Between January 2010 and December 2014, Sparks was working as a bookkeeper for both the Parraguirres and Antonacci when she transferred money from Antonacci's accounts to Leslie Parraguirre's business accounts without authorization, according to documents in the criminal case.

Records stated that Sparks used Antonacci's signature stamp to write unauthorized checks, made unauthorized cash transfers and used Antonacci's Office Depot card to take $201,096.22 from Antonacci's accounts and move it to Leslie Parraguirre's.

Leslie Parraguirre said she was

▶ See BOOKKEEPER, Page 3B

▶ BOOKKEEPER

Continued from Page 1B

battling breast cancer and her mother was near death when the theft occurred.

Her mother's condition and her own health complications in 2012 forced her to be distracted from the business she ran for 30 years. She had employed Sparks for the previous six years.

"I was being assassinated financially, in business and personally, and I had no idea," Leslie Parraguirre said. "What human being steals your inheritance on the day of your mother's funeral? I know that I will be in my own private prison for at least 24 years, trying to make up for the criminal acts of Sparks."

Antonacci said Sparks had paid her back a portion of the stolen money.

"All I want is my money back," Antonacci told Villani. "And the Parraguirres have my money. The Parraguirres say they owe me nothing. They say Sparks owes me."

The judge stopped Antonacci and instructed her to speak about how the actions of Sparks had affected her.

"By incarcerating her," Antonacci said, "I get nothing."

Sparks asked Villani for leniency and said, "I've learned my lesson. I'm sorry for what I did."

Antonacci filed her lawsuit in 2014, demanding $180,000 for money traded from her account to Colours. Sparks, Colours and Leslie Parraguirre were named as defendants in the ongoing case, which seeks "the return of monies wrongfully taken" from Antonacci's accounts.



JASON OGULNIK/LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL
Leslie Parraguirre appears in court during sentencing for her former bookkeeper, Roxanne Sparks, Tuesday at the Regional Justice Center. Sparks illegally transferred more than $200,000 to Parraguirre's business accounts between 2010 and 2014.

Leslie Parraguirre and Colours filed a separate lawsuit in Clark County District Court, arguing that Sparks admitted to manipulating her company and personal accounts.

That lawsuit does not name Sparks as a defendant but accuses Nyberg and Associates, Colours' accounting firm at the time of the theft; the firm's owner, James Nyberg; and its employee Daniel Geiger of professional negligence, breach of contract, negligent misrepresentation, negligent hiring and supervision and breach of fiduciary duty

Contact David Ferrara at dferrara@reviewjournal.com or 702-380-1039. Follow @randompoker on Twitter

LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL NEVADA & THE WEST

B Saturday-Sunday April 8-9, 2017 reviewjournal.com

A California woman has settled her federal lawsuit against the wife of Nevada Supreme Court Chief Justice Ron Parraguirre for an undisclosed amount.

The settlement marks the end of a three-year legal battle ignited when a bookkeeper improperly transferred more than $200,000 to Las Vegas interior designer Leslie Parraguirre.

The confidential settlement reached between Antonacci and the defendants in the lawsuit — Leslie Parraguirre and her design firm, Colours Inc. — prohiblts either party from discussing details of the agreement.

Location : Justice Court

REGISTER OF ACTIONS

CASE NO. 15M29495X

State of Nevada vs. PARRAGUIRRE, LESLIE G

§
§
§
§
§

Case Type: **Citation**
Date Filed: **02/02/2016**
Location: **JC Department 12**

PARTY INFORMATION

Lead Attorneys

Defendant **PARRAGUIRRE, LESLIE G**
Other Agency Numbers
7026556 Justice Court Scope ID Subject Identifier

State of Nevada **State of Nevada**

CHARGE INFORMATION

Charges: PARRAGUIRRE, LESLIE G	**Statute**	**Level**	**Date**
1. Battery [50212]	200.481.2a	Misdemeanor	02/02/2016

EVENTS & ORDERS OF THE COURT

DISPOSITIONS

02/04/2016 **Disposition** (Judicial Officer: Sullivan, Diana L.)
1. Battery [50212]
Dismissed - State Not Proceeding (Nolle Prosequi)

OTHER EVENTS AND HEARINGS

02/02/2016 **CTRACK Track Assignment JC12**
02/03/2016 **Complaint Filed-Dismissed-State Not Proceeding**
02/04/2016 **Case Closed - Dismissed State Not Proceeding**
02/04/2016 **Judgment Entered**
02/04/2016 **Notice of Disposition and Judgment**

5. MOVEMENT

Even the timid can take this simple step toward spiritual independence. To make a difference in the world, you just have to get on a criminal jury – and vote your conscience. If enough walk this righteous path of individual resistance, the inhuman system of government lies and violence may finally begin to collapse. End your slavery.

“The law will never make men free; it is men who have got to make the law free.”

-Henry David Thoreau (1817–1862)
American author, philosopher, and tax resister.

“All this we see, and, therefore, instead of inanely repeating the old formula 'Respect the law,' we say, 'Despise law and all its attributes!' In place of the cowardly phrase, 'Obey the law,' our cry is 'Revolt against all laws!'”

-Pëtr Kropotkin
Kropotkin, P. (1886). *Law and authority*.

In the United States, it takes just one juror to cause a mistrial because the jury verdict must be unanimous. A mistrial is declared when a unanimous result cannot be reached and further deliberation is deemed futile. That “right” to a unanimous jury verdict in a “serious” criminal case (punishable by more than 6 months in jail) was first granted to the subjects in 2020. Ramos v. Louisiana, 590 U.S. 83 (2020) (overruling Apodaca v. Oregon, 406 U.S. 404 (1972), and holding that the Sixth Amendment requires unanimous jury verdicts in state as well as federal jury trials involving “serious” crimes). Jury unanimity had always been a federal common law requirement, since 1789, along with the centuries-long requirement of a 12-person jury. Thompson v. Utah, 170 U.S. 343 (1898).

However, in 1970, “rights” were revoked, and six-person juries were held perfect for all non-capital felonies, both state and federal. Williams v. Florida, 399 U.S. 78 (1970). So ultimately, in 2025, 44 states, plus the federal government and Washington, D.C., still require 12-person juries for all felony “crimes.” Arizona, Connecticut, Florida, Indiana, Massachusetts, and Utah allow smaller juries (6–8) for most felonies. Thus, for now, ~85% of all U.S. felony jury trials have 12 jurors.



THE **SECOND AMENDMENT**
DOES **NOT** GRANT US
THE **RIGHT** TO **BEAR ARMS.**

THE **SECOND AMENDMENT**
DENIES THE **GOVERNMENT**
THE **AUTHORITY** TO
INFRINGE UPON OUR **RIGHT**
TO **BEAR ARMS.**

BEWARE!

MARK OF AFFILIATION

WELL-ORGANIZED

CLAIMED TERRITORY

COSTUME-WEARING

HEAVILY ARMED

AGGRESSIVE & EXTREMELY VIOLENT

GANG MEMBER

Mistrials can be declared for many reasons, including attorney, juror, or party misconduct, and illness or death, but hung juries remain by far the most common cause of mistrials. In both federal and state jury trials, hung juries account for around 75% of all mistrials. In federal jury trials, the mistrial rate is about 2–4%, with an acquittal rate in the 10–15% range. In state jury trials, the acquittal rate is slightly higher, with the mistrial rate roughly double the federal rate, near 4–8%.

After a hung jury mistrial, a retrial is generally allowed, *ad infinitum*. A mistrial due to jury deadlock is deemed a "manifest necessity" and double jeopardy is not violated regardless of how many re-trials are held. United States v. Perez, 22 U.S. 579 (1824). Usually, the prosecutor will give up after two or three tries.

The United States record for hung jury mistrials in a single case is four (4), held by John A. "Junior" Gotti, son of the infamous New York Gambino crime boss John Gotti. Junior Gotti faced a federal racketeering prosecution with charges of extortion, loansharking, fraud, money laundering, and other organized crime activities under the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations (RICO) Act. In other words, he was charged with exactly what the government does every single day under law. Junior was tried in Manhattan federal court in New York City in 2005, 2006, 2006, and 2009. All hung jury mistrials. The federal government finally gave up after its fourth failed prosecution attempt.

Notably, even if a unanimous verdict IS reached by the jury, guilty or not guilty, the defendant still remains subject to another trial for the exact same offense. Gamble v. United States. That is the law. And another fantastic reason to just vote "Not Guilty" no matter what. If the government doesn't trust you to determine the final verdict in the case, why did they waste your time with bogus jury "duty?" Just pass your fake "responsibility" on to the next guy. "Not Guilty."

After a hung jury mistrial:

~25% of cases dismissed by prosecutor.
~40% of cases end via compromise plea bargain.
~35% RETRIAL. With conviction probability now around 50–70%.

Procedure is punishment. The government weighs its options, dumps its losers, and browbeats the remaining targets. Obedience is always demanded: "Take the plea or we'll do it again." It's all about resources, jail status, and numbers games. Overtly unfair government pressure and coercion are openly used to enforce continued submission. Even moreso after a mistrial. As always, government risks nothing, and can do whatever it wants – no matter what. That is its primary trait.

Legally, only a jury can stand up to the tyranny. The U.S. is an outlier. It only takes *one* juror, and a jury is mandatory. Under the current law, since 1670, there is no risk, and it can be done as many times as any juror determines necessary, *ad infinitum*. That is the law. Bushel's Case (1670) Vaughan 135; 124 ER 1006.

“If you teach that nigger how to read, there would be no keeping him. It would forever unfit him to be a slave. He would at once become unmanageable, and of no value to his master.”

-Slaveowner Mr. Auld
Douglass, Frederick. *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, an American Slave*. Boston: Anti-Slavery Office, 1845.

With a 12-person jury, if just **5.62%** of the jury pool commits to vote “Not Guilty” automatically for a particular “crime” or category of crimes, then at least 50% of trials will result in a mistrial or an acquittal, probably 60%+ including the standard 10–15% acquittal rate. This will disrupt the system – severely. Whoever disrupts a system controls it. Plea bargains will change dramatically, quickly, and many more defendants within that “crime” category will also demand trial. The jury unanimity rule is leveraged to greatly amplify the impact of just a small number of wise jurors' decisions. This can create a real impact, and affect many, even considering the relatively tiny percentage of cases that actually go to trial.

If you increase that juror participation to **12.56%** of the jury pool, one in eight, automatically voting “Not Guilty” respecting a particular “crime” or category of crimes, then at least 80% of jury trials will result in a mistrial or an acquittal, which translates into more than 90% including the standard 10–15% acquittal rate. This will effectively eliminate that particular felony “crime” category altogether – and help to end the United States “legal” system as we know it.

“For anarchy to succeed or simply to advance towards its success it must be conceived not only as a lighthouse which illuminates and attracts, but as something possible and attainable, not in centuries to come, but in a relatively short time and without relying on miracles.”

-Errico Malatesta

IMPLIED MISTRIAL/ACQUITTAL RATE

from % of JURY POOL Voting "NOT GUILTY"

12-Person Jury – Binomial Model

JURY POOL "INCLINATION" MODEL
UNANIMITY required;
RANDOM selection;
INDEPENDENT votes.

% of Jury Pool voting NOT GUILTY	% of Cases ending in Acquittal/Mistrial
0.43%	5%
0.88%	10%
1.35%	15%
1.85%	20%
2.37%	25%
2.93%	30%
3.53%	35%
4.17%	40%
4.86%	45%
5.62%	**50%**
6.44%	55%
7.36%	60%
8.38%	65%
9.55%	70%
10.92%	75%
12.56%	**80%**
14.63%	85%
17.46%	90%
22.10%	95%

p = probability that juror from Jury Pool votes "Not Guilty."
Conviction requires all 12 jurors to vote "Guilty." → P(convict) = (1-p)^12
% of Cases ending in Acquittal/Mistrial = 1 - P(convict)

IMPLIED BINOMIAL JURY OUTCOMES - 12 JURORS



The real consequences implied by the chart are not merely mathematically correct; they are conservative in at least one respect. In the real world, correlation among non-committed (likely uneducated) jurors will increase the standard acquittal percentage, and the mistrial rate, because a single visible holdout often emboldens others, which then strengthens individual resolve. Consequently, both the acquittal rate and mistrial rate will be amplified on this indisputable mathematical basis – and systematic disruption will increase accordingly.

However, the figures are also slightly optimistic in one respect. A higher percentage of the jury pool is actually necessary to reach the trial probability results reflected in the chart. This is true because those with knowledge of jury nullification will be removed by the lying system at a higher rate than for the typical ignorant and/or uneducated juror. United States v. Thomas, 116 F.3d 606 (2d Cir. 1997) (jury nullification violates a juror's oath to “render a true verdict according to the law and the evidence.”). This unfortunately holds true even if nullifiers rigorously use all proper and appropriate techniques to avoid removal.

Lastly, it will be more difficult to achieve the desired percentages within the jury pool than a standard distribution of the population would suggest. The numbers will be harder to achieve than might be expected because those wise citizens likely to embrace freedom are also far less likely to vote. Since the jury roll is primarily derived from voter rolls and DMV records, non-voters are by design underrepresented in the jury pool. Therefore, many like-minded sympathetic individuals are excluded from participation in the movement. In this sense, simply registering to vote can be a successful attack on the existing system, as long as you never actually vote, but simply desire to increase the likelihood that you might be chosen to serve on a jury, and thereby empowered to nullify a law.

This movement is not anarchy, and is not civil disobedience. It is resistance to tyranny. It is a right under the Constitution, and a duty under the Declaration of Independence. It is about *following* the Constitution, as you see it, and lawfully correcting those judges and other lawmakers who are lawlessly empowered, allowed, and designed to destroy freedom and individual rights. The movement is about reclaiming the power that was stolen from the People by the government 130 years ago through blatant lies and overt censorship. Sparf.

The movement recommends and requires only lawful behavior operating within the existing legal system. Even if perfectly implemented for years, rulers will remain, but they will have less control over “crime” and punishment. Within the law, pursuant to mathematics, a small minority of the citizenry can effectively invalidate a “crime” or category of crimes – without any legitimate risk at all.

Although not anarchy, it is a step towards anarchy, which simply means no rulers. This should be the desired result for everyone who doesn't want to be a slave. Ironically, the movement is actual obedience to the controlling system and its overbearing Constitution, while it will be lawlessly and dishonestly portrayed as the exact opposite by the pathetic lawbreaking state and its willing slaves.

THE POTENTIAL JURY POOL

Position on the State	Most Common Self-Labels	Estimated U.S. Adult Share
Pro-state Supports the state's legitimacy/necessity and consciously identifies with typical political ideologies.	Liberals, conservatives, moderates, progressives, socialists, nationalists, independents, libertarians, minarchists.	**70–80%**
Apolitical Little to no interest in politics.	Disengaged (chronic non-voters).	**20–30%**
Anti-state Believes no state should exist.	Anarchists (all tendencies).	**1–2%**

Sources: Aggregated from: Pew Research Center (2023–2025 reports on political engagement), AP-NORC (Dec 2024 news fatigue poll), Gallup (2025 tracking on interest), General Social Survey (2022–2024), YouGov (2023–2024).

THE ACTUAL JURY POOL

The “Potential Jury Pool” includes the entire U.S. adult population's ideological distribution. The resulting “Actual Jury Pool” = Jury venire is smaller. It is drawn primarily from voter registration lists and driver's license/state ID lists, and then filtered by disqualifications, exemptions, and non-response. Then, further, cause challenges and peremptory strikes. Thus, some groups: young adults, non-voters, marginalized populations, and those with felony convictions – are systematically underrepresented. Therefore, the final seated jury usually overrepresents pro-state, politically engaged citizens compared to the broader adult population.

MORE JURY POOL FACTS

Selection Steps: Summons →Venire→Voir dire→Cause strikes→Peremptories →Sworn jury.

Auto Disqualifiers: Non-citizen; under 18; non-resident; inadequate English; incapacity; felony convictions without rights restored.

Hardship Excuses: Medical limits; essential caregiver; severe financial hardship; essential-duty jobs; recent jury service.

Cause Challenges: Eliminates juror if judge determines removal appropriate. *Unlimited.* Bias, relationship, prior knowledge, statutory disqualification.

Peremptory Strikes: Eliminates juror without stated reason (must be non-discriminatory).
Federal: Govt. 6, Defense 10. Capital case: 20 per side.
States: Typically 6–20 allowed for each side.

Actual Service Rate: Roughly 1–5% of summoned individuals are ultimately seated.

TAKE IT SERIOUSLY. GET SELECTED. SAVE A LIFE.

If the judge forbids discussion of nullification in a trial, and a party in the trial then defies that rule, they might be charged with contempt. Even though they didn't break a law, they broke a rule defined by the judge for that trial.

But you cannot be asked why you voted as you did and you cannot be punished for your vote.

Come into court looking like a respectable American devoid of politics. Don't act like you are excited to be there. Act bored and a smidgeon annoyed.

Jury selection is not the time for speeches. Generally, the less you say, the more likely you are to get on the jury. Tell the truth, but give short answers. If asked about Jury Nullification, admit you've heard of it but you will keep an open mind, closely judge the facts, and focus on justice. You will!

According to Black's Law Dictionary, a true verdict is one "where each juror has duly considered the case and come to their own conclusion without any persuasion or outside influences." So you can nullify AND deliver a "true verdict" at the same time. Your job as a juror is to take in all the info you've heard from the witnesses, lawyers and the judge, evaluate it with your conscience, and decide what justice is for this defendant. That's a true verdict.

CRIMINAL TRIALS

Once on the jury, follow the rules attentively. Do not mention nullification during deliberations. If the judge believes you are voting by conscience you may be removed, causing a mistrial or allowing the remaining jurors to decide the case. But if a juror has doubts on the facts, she cannot be dismissed. If she justifies her "not guilty" vote by saying "I can't convict a young man for smoking a joint," she's gone. If she says "I suspect the officer lied" the judge must return her to deliberations.

Focusing on evidentiary standards or concern with police testimony may sway other jurors looking for an excuse to likewise vote their conscience.

The inability to discuss nullification openly encourages hung juries. If you must, hang. A hung jury can lead to a case being dropped or charges lowered in a follow up trial. Reasonable people may disagree. You have a right to hang. Vote your conscience even if other jurors try to browbeat you.

GRAND JURIES

Grand juries are infamously used for repression and harassment by the state because the evidentiary standards are weak, the prosecutor has complete control and can spin a tale unopposed, those subpoenaed are denied rights, and jurors do not have to reach unanimity to indict, making nullification harder.

This is an opportunity to ask hard-hitting questions, to press back on the prosecution. You can point out weak spots, sway other jurors, and leave a transcript that will help the defense in any later trial.

THE FULLY INFORMED JURY ASSOCIATION
7090 N ORACLE RD STE 178-310
TUCSON, AZ 85704

The author of *THE 6 PERCENT EFFORT* has no affiliation or relationship whatsoever with → and simply presents their fine materials for reader benefit with thanks & full attribution. FIJA has no responsibility whatsoever for the other contents of this book.

FIJA.ORG

THIS BROCHURE IS NOT COPYRIGHTED
REPRODUCE WITH ATTRIBUTION

LVL

JURY NULLIFICATION?

BE A FULLY INFORMED JUROR

YOUR RIGHT TO VOTE YOUR CONSCIENCE

AND HOW TO DO SO EFFECTIVELY

JURIES ARE A VITAL CHECK ON STATE POWER!

Our jury system is the hard-won result of centuries of struggles against tyranny. The jury's right to judge laws, heavy-handed enforcement, and broader issues of justice was a recurring feature from the start.

"Jury nullification" was long championed by movements for liberty in England like the Levellers. And American jurors nullifying laws on assembly and libel infamously laid the foundation for our Free Speech norms.

In the nineteenth century, juries repeatedly refused to convict runaway slaves and their accomplices in the underground railroad. During prohibition, juries refused to convict people for merely drinking alcohol. In the 60s and 70s, juries repeatedly refused to convict civil rights and antiwar activists—despite evidence of their guilt and sometimes their frank admission—on the grounds that they were justified in acting to stop greater injustice. Thanks to widespread rejection of the drug war and police misconduct, it is estimated that 3-4% of jury trials involve nullification.

YOU TOO CAN BE ONE OF THESE HERO JURORS!

The right to jury nullification is built into the history and structure of our legal system. And many at the highest level of the US legal system have long recognized the right of jurors to judge the law and the context, not just the bare fact of a crime.

> It is not only [the juror's] right, but his duty... to find the verdict according to his own best understanding, judgement, and *conscience*, though in direct opposition to the direction of the court.
>
> **JOHN ADAMS, 2ND PRESIDENT OF THE US**

The right and necessity of nullification is recognized across the political spectrum...

> At the beginning, when the Constitution was ratified, juries used to find not only the facts, but the law... Juries can ignore the law where they think that in this case the law is producing a terrible result... And that makes them a check not just on the judges but of course on the legislature.
>
> **ANTONIN SCALIA, SUPREME COURT JUSTICE**

> If it weren't for what juries did during the civil rights movement, if it weren't for jury nullification, we would have many civil rights individuals who would be convicted felons or otherwise for things that today we think are protected by the First Amendment. There is a place, I think, for jury nullification
>
> **SONIA SOTOMAYOR, SUPREME COURT JUSTICE**

The first Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, John Jay, told jurors they had the right to judge facts ***and the law***. In 1805, one of the charges against Justice Samuel Chase in his impeachment was that he wrongly prevented an attorney from arguing to a jury that the law should not be followed.

Yet most prosecutors and judges hate the erosion of their power and now leverage intimidation and selection questions to weed out informed jurors. They have won the right to lie to jurors—just like cops have the right to lie—and even to oblige "oaths" that jurors will only vote on the facts, putting aside their conscience. ***These are still lies and no oath can legally bind your final vote.***

We have juries not because they're experts on fact or law, but precisely to provide a check of public conscience!

THE STAKES IN OUR SYSTEM ARE IMMENSE!

Because judges and prosecutors try everything to filter out jurors who know their power, some approach "Jury Nullification" as something like a cheat phrase that you can utter to get out of jury duty. And yes, they might dismiss you if you swing around this pamphlet and proclaim that you will vote "not guilty" no matter what.

It's true that Jury Duty can be a significant inconvenience—but please consider ***why*** they have made it so annoying to serve on a jury.

Today, at your courthouse, it's likely that someone who committed a victimless crime or violated a law in a justified situation or extenuating context will be sent to prison. And many people who committed objectionable or deplorable acts will be sentenced following extreme sentencing guidelines that many of the jurors who vote to convict have no say in and will find shocking and/or repulsive.

These human beings will lose years, possibly even decades of their lives in an overcrowded prison system, each costing taxpayers $40,000-65,000 a year. They will experience extreme hardships that will weigh on them forever, irreparably damaging their mind and employment opportunities, as well as leaving many burdened with crippling debt. This will also inflict lasting damages on their community and loved ones—it steals away an average of 2.6 years of life expectancy from the family members of those incarcerated.†

And yet ***you can do something about it.***

By working to get selected for a jury rather than trying to avoid it, you can trade a few days of your time and quite likely save someone's life!

https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8164096/

LEGITIMATE RISK?

There really are no legitimate risks to a juror who votes their conscience. You have a right to decide the facts and the law yourself. Bushel's Case (1670). For victimless "crimes" an automatic "Not Guilty" vote is specifically *following* the real law. It is your absolute DUTY as a juror to vote "Not Guilty" in this circumstance. The parasite government judge and prosecutor are both lying. They want you to do wrong. They tell you as a juror that what you think about the law doesn't matter, but, actually, it is all that matters. Their claim is an easily provable outright lie. The proof is that you can do whatever you want.

For example, all gun and drug "crimes" are unconstitutional – by definition. See Declaration of Independence; See Second Amendment. Every single one. That is a legal fact, and your personal belief alone confirms that it is a binding legal fact. That is all that matters. You are right. "Not Guilty." Your legal conclusions as a juror are correct by definition. Unalienable. Unchallengeable. Unreviewable. Unreversible. Legally respected. United States v. Dougherty, 473 F.2d 1113, 1132 (D.C. Cir. 1972) (jurors possess an "unreviewable and unreversible power . . . to acquit in disregard of the instructions on the law given by the trial judge").

"Not Guilty." You don't have to say another word. That is your right.

The government claims its lies are controlling and binding and right, but its only real "proof" is that it is allowed to lie and use violence to spite you and serve itself. That is the law. However, concerning the unique right of jury nullification, all the United States government can really do is deceive, censor, and obstruct, exactly what it has been doing for the last 130 years. But, nevertheless, despite government's best evil efforts, the right of jury nullification remains.

Unfortunately, because of longstanding ruling-class lies, you have to be smart while exercising your right. Sparf (1895). But fortunately, history has also proven that there is no real legitimate risk to any juror no matter what. No juror has ever been convicted of a crime related to jury nullification in United States history. There have only been two (2) well-documented prosecution attempts ever. Both failed completely – miserably. See, e.g., People v. Kriho, 996 P.2d 158 (Colo. App. 1999) (juror contempt conviction reversed for judge's improper use of juror deliberation testimony; re-trial rejected and all charges dismissed by the state in 2000). In fact, not only is nullification never a crime, it is also extremely difficult to lawfully remove a holdout juror. Because all deliberation evidence is deemed confidential, the only practical way a court could prove intentional nullification is an admission. *To remain on the jury – just never admit that you are nullifying.* United States v. Thomas, 116 F.3d 606, 614–18 (2d Cir. 1997) (holding that a juror violates their oath by nullifying the law, but, nevertheless, a trial court may not remove a holdout juror unless "the record is clear beyond doubt that the juror is not, in fact, simply unpersuaded by the prosecution's case." – effectively shielding all seated nullifiers from removal unless they admit to nullifying). Simple.

NOT GUILTY LVL

You ALWAYS have the option of Not Guilty

- *even if you believe the law was broken*
- *even if the judge says you must convict*

Judges are officially not allowed to instruct jurors to convict, but courts have been extremely lenient with judges who lead jurors into Guilty verdicts they regret.

Don't fall for it!

Did the government prove beyond reasonable doubt that the accused broke the law?

NO → ✓ **NOT GUILTY**

There is no partial credit for the prosecution! Each charge must be proved beyond a reasonable doubt every time.

YES ↓

Is the law that was broken Constitutional?

NO → ✓ **NOT GUILTY**

The Constitution is the highest law of the land. When lower and higher law conflict, lower law must give way.

YES ↓

Is the law that was broken just (and justly applied in the case at hand)?

NO → ✓ **NOT GUILTY**

Do not check your conscience or your common sense at the courthouse door! Apply them to deliver just verdicts.

YES ↓

Was anyone harmed? Was anyone's property harmed?

NO → ✓ **NOT GUILTY**

Consider whether you would be doing justice to harm someone who has not harmed anyone or their property.

YES ↓

Does the punishment fit the crime?

NO → ✓ **NOT GUILTY**

Mandatory sentences can result in unfair punishment. Excessive penalties are unjust, expensive for taxpayers, and can ruin lives.

YES ↓

Do other factors exist that would make strict enforcement of the law unjust in this case?

YES → ✓ **NOT GUILTY**

Jurors have the ability to temper law with mercy when circumstances call for it.

FIJA.org

“CRIME” CATEGORIES – NULLIFY?

If you understand freedom, you must recognize and appreciate that every single law, whether you agree with it or not, inhibits freedom. Fact. Even murder laws inhibit your freedom to murder, and are pure unadulterated hypocrisy when you consider how frequently the state murders, how frequently the state threatens to murder, and how low the state's standards are to “lawfully” murder. Don't stop your car when flashing lights appear behind you – and your state-sponsored death-warrant is signed. Along with the death-warrants of all collateral damage innocents resulting from the high-speed “police” chase that will ensue under law. Bow down to your master – or you will die. Additional government agents will quickly appear – all willing, allowed, and intending to kill you. That is the law.

So in conclusion, every category of “crime” is worthy of nullification in certain circumstances. Any law can be nullified appropriately – in appropriate circumstances. As a juror, you are the infallible judge of those circumstances. You are correct by definition. Law is what you say. Your conscience runs the show.

Any victimless “crime” should be nullified by the jury. All of them. Every time. The state cannot be a victim. The entire idea is absurd nonsense. People are victims, and the state is the victimizer – by law. The “state” is a fake entity – a religious illusion designed to enslave. It is built on fear, lies, and violence – and you owe it nothing. Including taxes. No victim. No crime.

Any case where a “Terry Stop” was used should be nullified in its entirety. Police “suspicion” cannot be reasonable or somehow replace the constitutional standard of “probable cause.” As a juror, if you believe it, it is true. Teach the “authorities” their lesson. This isn't some statist paddy-cakes game where 12 assigned slaves come together to achieve the result desired by their master. This is the real world, and a unanimous verdict is required for a “serious” “crime” “conviction” in the United States of America. That is the law – at least for now. Ramos v. Louisiana, 590 U.S. 83 (2020) (overruling Apodaca v. Oregon, 406 U.S. 404 (1972)).

When a defendant is charged with multiple “crimes” and your conscience dictates that one of them must be nullified, you should nullify them all unless your conscience objects. Overcharging by prosecutors is an unfair lawless plague. Generally speaking, the state just wants a conviction, at least one, so they charge as many “crimes” as they possibly can. The “state” will never learn its lesson if you vote to convict on some charges. One bogus charge taints all the other charges and the entire case. So, generally speaking, if one charge needs to be nullified, every single “crime” charged in the case should also be nullified. Whatever you think.

Just don't let the other jurors browbeat you – they are unknowing slaves.

You at least know the law. Slave.

"Obedience is mandatory, Johnny"

@PoliceThePolice

"If you just obey, I won't have to kill you."

GUN "CRIMES"

Any and all charged gun "crimes" must be nullified. They are all unconstitutional. See Constitution – Second Amendment ("shall not be infringed."). No questions asked. It is the jury's duty to nullify unconstitutional non-laws. When you vote "Not Guilty" because the "law" itself is unconstitutional or unjust, you are not defying the Constitution – you are the only one in the courtroom still enforcing it. Considering ~32% of all United States adults personally own a gun, there should never be another individual convicted of a felony gun "crime." Every single gun owner should protect all the others, and the jury pool should be at least 25% automatically "Not Guilty" on that sole basis – today. Either that, or gun owners are frauds and want everyone to be slaves, despite all their "freedom" rhetoric.

"Not Guilty." Every time. That is the law.

Top 2 Largest U.S. Employers - 2025

Indirect jobs calculated using BEA RIMS II / EPI multipliers (government 1.5× · retail 1.8×)

(Direct + Indirect Jobs Sustained – All Levels of Government Including Active-Duty Military)

Rank	Entity	Direct Jobs	Indirect Jobs	Total Jobs	% of U.S. Workforce
1	U.S. Government (Federal + State + Local + Military)	24.9 million	12.5 million	37.4 million	~22%
2	Walmart	1.6 million	1.4 million	3.0 million	~1.8%

Sources: BLS Sep 2025 · DoD Aug 2025 · Walmart FY2025

TAX "CRIMES"

Tax "crimes" are not unconstitutional; to the contrary, tax laws are specifically "constitutional" and always allowed in every possible way. Tax "crimes" are the very centerpiece of the state's theft and power scheme, and its "right" to steal is always clearly spelled out. Funding is always the first and foremost task of big government. It demands your money to grow and empower itself – to spite you. That is the law.

U.S. Tax Code (2025):

Statutory Tax Code (Internal Revenue Code):
~6,871 pages
~4.2 million words

IRS Regulations (Title 26 CFR):
~17,500 pages

Total (Code+Regulations+Guidance):
~75,000 pages
>16 million words

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

"The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises . . ."

Sixteenth Amendment (ratified 1913 - supposedly)

"The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration."

- - -

While criminal tax laws are not unconstitutional, they are always unjust, and must all be nullified. You shouldn't be caged for just trying to keep your wealth. Unfortunately, even if every "serious" tax "crime" disappears tomorrow, the state will still possess most of its ability to steal. Federal income tax withholding, civil penalties, and "petty" misdemeanors are enough coercion to fund the evil beast. There is no need or honest rationale for government to threaten its subjects with prison time for trying to prevent a completely unnecessary outright theft.

With 100% of the jury pool also taxpaying slaves, this particular nullification effort should be the easiest one of all. Every single taxpayer should protect all the others, shield them from a criminal conviction, and get the exact same protection in return for themselves. Government has no right to steal. "Not Guilty." Always.

"DRUGS"

A constitutional amendment (Eighteenth) was held necessary in 1919 to outlaw alcohol. But today, many plants that naturally grow in the ground are claimed to be illegal by the Feds, and the DEA alone exercises its unconstitutional stolen power to ban and criminalize substances and molecules before they even exist. Innocent people are caged for doing nothing wrong. The sheep citizenry just take it, and some want even more. Many of the plantation slaves want daddy government to keep them "safe" by lawlessly threatening and imprisoning their wise neighbors who have a living spirit and human desires. Lawless violence is the "supreme" "law" for some – wicked rulers and cowardly slaves alike. Wickard v. Filburn, 317 U.S. 111 (1942) (first holding that Congress may regulate the cultivation or possession of a plant (wheat) grown on one's own land for personal use – never sold, never transported, and never entering commerce – because such activity, "taken together with that of many others similarly situated," has a "substantial economic effect on interstate commerce," thereby granting Congress a de facto general police power to ban and criminalize any substance or activity whatsoever pursuant to the re-imagined Commerce Clause); Gonzales v. Raich, 545 U.S. 1 (2005) (completing Wickard's evisceration of enumerated federal powers by upholding the federal criminal prohibition of wholly intrastate, non-commercial cultivation and possession of Marijuana grown in a California resident's own home for personal use authorized by state law – Marijuana that never left the premises, never changed hands, and never entered any market – solely because Congress had a so-called "rational basis" for the prohibition). Today, the "Commerce Clause" creates the fake "authority" to allow Congress to outlaw virtually every human activity imaginable. That is the law.

In truth, the court in Wickard was right about the economic impact, but economic impact cannot overwhelm the Ninth and Tenth Amendments or, more importantly, the unalienable God-given right to Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness. Unless you're an evil tyrant money-grubbing slaveowner or overseer, like the United States government and its many violent slave-driving agents. Free people are allowed to grow and consume wheat for themselves without government intervention. And do whatever "drugs" they want. Fact. Anything else is a tyrannical joke. With "drug" laws, big daddy government takes full ownership and control of your body, and punishes you in advance for future imagined "bad" conduct that almost never occurs. Typical government tactic. Completely dishonest government lies. That is the law.

All "drug" laws are completely unconstitutional – by dishonest evil design. Every such "law"must be nullified – every time. If necessary, you alone can properly overwhelm the ramblings of *all* the other jurors because unanimity is required. Their opinions are unnecessary for a mistrial. Pretend to "deliberate" – stay resolute and don't get removed. The opinions of a parasite "judge" and prosecutor are completely irrelevant. Court "instructions" are biased state propaganda – and may be lawfully ignored. Vote "Not Guilty" and there is nothing they can do. Fact.

Jury Defense of Your Body

Juror nullification occurs when a juror refuses to convict a person because of bad or misapplied law. Many bad laws are based on government's falsely-assumed ownership of your body. Refusing to enforce bad laws by nullifying them is the highest duty of a juror. Jurors can defend your ownership and management of your body, and thus all your other rights. Jurors have the authority to judge the law and its application, and to veto bad laws by "not guilty" verdicts. ***Jurors cannot be punished for their verdicts.***

If you want to defend an individual's ownership of his or her body, you must first get on the jury. During jury selection, lawyers and judges try to remove informed people from juries. Power-corrupted lawyers and judges depend on seating jurors who will do whatever they are told by government, even in violation of good conscience, reasoning, common sense and constitutional law.

When called for jury duty and questioned about your understanding of the law or issues, consider stating that you do not keep track of political issues, and that you can apply the law as instructed by the court. If asked, suggest that you do not remember if you belong to any particular organizations because you get too many junk mail organizational solicitations. Imply an impartial attitude.

You may be the only informed person on the jury. The judge's instructions and oaths to the jurors are designed to fool jurors and protect the raw power of judges. Despite their official-sounding nature, these instructions to jurors cannot be legally binding, or there would be no need for the authority of independently-thinking jurors.

You hold the absolute right to vote your conscience. If the accused did not identifiably damage an actual person, or for any other reason, you can find him or her not guilty. Regardless of other jurors, you cannot be forced to change your verdict. You can state that the government prosecutor did not prove the government case. Or you can state no reason for your verdict, as is your right.

Fully Informed Jury Association

FIJA.org



Government judges and prosecutors crave raw power beyond the legal limit to their authority. That power can only exist if the person brought before the court is deceived by process into surrendering ownership of his or her body, and responsibility for individual decisions about that body, to government and the courts. Informed jurors, who do not seek any power, can defend the right of individual ownership of the body for everyone, equally. Jurors can refuse to convict if the government's case is based on the concept of government owning an individual's body, or if the government judges or prosecutors pretend to have any right to make or enforce any decisions about an individual's body.

Who Owns Your Body?

"The right of the people to be secure in their persons ... against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated ..."

The human right that controls all other rights is the absolute ownership and management of one's own body. Without complete ownership of your body, you cannot hold rights.

Throughout history, kings and dictators claimed ownership of everyone's body as a way to control all people and their actions. The U.S. Constitution reversed that flawed form of government. But now, government again claims the power of kings, seizing ownership of your body. Their actions, rather than their lies, prove that the government holds no compassion or respect for you. To government, your body is merely a working device it owns, to be taxed.

The Jury is your defense.

Personal Defense

It is above question that each individual holds the unalienable right to completely own and manage his or her body. No one is more qualified than you to manage your body responsibly and with dignity. The silly assumption that government personnel, who make as many mistakes as everyone else, can successfully manage their bodies AND yours shows the unmatched ignorance of government officials, especially judges and prosecutors.

Constitutional Defense

The Fourth, Ninth, and Tenth Amendments of the Bill of Rights make it clear that government has no authority to own or manage our bodies. Individual ownership rights extend to decisions for your body, defense of your body, health care choices, privacy, gun possession on your person, body decoration, alternative medicines and supplements, vaccinations, and more. Laws claiming government ownership of your body demonstrate that the greatest threat to human rights is always from one's own government.

Jury Defense

You, as one individual, cannot do much to effect legislation. But as a juror, YOU can effectively defend each person's absolute ownership of his or her body. One person can "hang" a jury by refusing to convict. If you are called to serve on a jury, do so! In turn, if your individual management of your body is ever described as a crime, because the government claims ownership of your body, wouldn't you want a member of your jury to know that was a fraud? You want jurors who understand that they can hang a jury by simply stating that the prosecutor failed to prove the government case. ***Or you can state no reason for your verdict, as is your right.***

Defense with Knowledge

More information on defending this absolute right to own and manage your body, which gives you the knowledge to defeat the lies of lawyers and judges, is available at **www.fija.org.** You and your family and friends will want to learn and share this priceless knowledge about jury authority. It is the best peaceful means to protect us all.

The History and Effect of Jury Nullification

Liberty exists only among reasoning people who are tolerant of human diversity. Tyranny thrives on intolerance. Conscientious jurors defend liberty when they refuse to convict fellow citizens maliciously accused of crimes. Reasoning jurors stopped the Salem Witch Trials of 1692 and freed tax protesters after the Whiskey Rebellion of 1794. Juries refused to convict under the Fugitive Slave Act in 1850, during Prohibition 1920-30, Vietnam War objectors, tax protesters, medical marijuana users, peaceful gun owners, and others.

The last peaceful defense of our liberties is the jury. Writers of our Constitution understood that power always corrupts. The people must retain, understand and use all the processes to defend themselves from the greatest threat to liberty: one's own government. Informed grand jurors and trial jurors can protect you from bad government laws.

There are countless inferior laws, based on government's assumed ownership of our bodies, that contradict the superior laws of our Constitution and common law. With all the bad laws on the books, it is only a matter of time before you, your family, or friends are accused of some crime. Your last peaceful line of defense is informed jurors who refuse to convict under bad laws based on government's assumed ownership of your body. You hold all rights to completely own and be responsible for your body.

Corrupt prosecutors and judges are common. Anyone can easily go through the process to become a lawyer or judge. The US is overrun by them. They are common people, who hold no more intelligence or reasoning ability than any other common person, and often less because of their egos and craving for more power. The duty and design of the citizen juror is to apply reasoning devoid of any craving for power. Lawyers and judges literally cannot understand that concept, even if they read these words, which is why wise people instituted the citizen jury system. ***Jurors hold the authority to render a verdict against the demands of power-hungry lawyers and judges.***

Today, your understanding of the authority for juror nullification is critically important due to increasing numbers of fear-based laws. These laws are supported by both political parties, by politically-appointed government judges and prosecutors, and by United Nations leadership.

Jurors can nullify bad laws by refusing to convict people being tried under those laws. When jurors refuse to convict, legislators and prosecutors know the law is NOT supported by the community. Acquittals and hung juries are politically embarrassing to legislators, power-craving prosecutors, bureaucrats, and most judges.

It cost many lives to establish a jury system designed to protect our individual rights. One informed person on each jury can regain these rights.

Defending Body Ownership Creates an Alliance of Traditional Opponents

Many favorite rights of conservatives, and other favorite rights of liberals, have been reduced to privileges, granted or denied at whim of government officers, by the same flawed process. That process assumes government ownership of individual bodies, and implies the willful surrender of that right by the individual.

As an adult, if you willfully surrendered your right to ingest substances of your choice, or to have a gun on your person, which are actions of the body that damage no other person, by not expressly objecting to gun and drug laws, you do not own your body. The government owns it.

That concept in law has voided human rights, replacing them with privileges, because uninformed jurors have not protected the absolute right of all conservatives and liberals to own and manage their own bodies.

1-800-TEL-JURY **www.fija.org**

THE EMPIRE STRIKES BACK

When rights are reclaimed, the state will fight back – by any and all means deemed necessary. On top of the lies, censorship, and violent agents it has been employing for the last 130 years. Sparf v. United States, 156 U.S. 51 (1895). The United States always fights hard to keep its stolen power. It is the superstate.

"The Party seeks power entirely for its own sake. We are not interested in the good of others; we are interested solely in power. Not wealth or luxury or long life or happiness: only power, pure power. . . . We know that no one ever seizes power with the intention of relinquishing it. Power is not a means, it is an end. One does not establish a dictatorship in order to safeguard a revolution; one makes the revolution in order to establish the dictatorship. The object of persecution is persecution. The object of torture is torture. The object of power is power. . . . The first thing you must realize is that power is collective. The individual only has power in so far as he ceases to be an individual. You know the Party slogan 'Freedom is Slavery'. Has it ever occurred to you that it is reversible? Slavery is freedom. Alone—free—the human being is always defeated. It must be so, because every human being is doomed to die, which is the greatest of all failures. But if he can make complete—utter submission; if he can escape from his identity; if he can merge himself in the Party so that he is the Party, then he is all-powerful and immortal. The second thing you must realize is that power is power over human beings. Over the body—but above all, over the mind. Power over matter—external reality, as you would call it—is not important. Already our control over matter is absolute."

-O'Brien – the Party's High Priest. Monologue to Winston.
Orwell, George. (1949). *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, part 3, chapter 3.

If mistrials rise a noticeable amount, the state will plan its new attack. It will begin exploring all possible counter-measures to defeat the individual – because it is the state. This offensive could be triggered with as low as 1% of the jury pool auto-voting "Not Guilty" for a particular "crime" or category of crimes. If such participation ever got up to 2% it would be noticeable for sure, as 30%+ of certain crime categories would then end in acquittal or mistrial. Jury questioning might be quickly expanded with a focus on nullification, including mandatory questions given to all potential jurors on the topic. The state needs jurors to fear the truth.

WEAPONS TO BE DEPLOYED BY UNITED STATES FEDERAL AND STATE GOVERNMENTS AGAINST THE INDIVIDUAL Re: JURY NULLIFICATION

1. "ENHANCED"/MANDATORY JUROR QUESTIONING & INDOCTRINATION

Just more of the same. Courts could intensify voir dire to more effectively and completely root out potential nullifiers, asking pointed mandatory questions about nullification itself, in addition to extra general questions concerning juror attitudes about laws, government, and law enforcement. Maybe a pre-trial written declaration or oath will have to be signed by every juror acknowledging that the court's laws and instructions are supreme, and you know and respect that you have no right to judge the law. Possibly AI will routinely scrape all public online history of all jurors to grade them on various categories, like nullification likelihood. Similar searches and probability analysis are already routinely done in high-profile cases today, and will only get easier with time. Then peremptory challenges might be increased for the state, to better and more fully remove those identified as likely nullifiers. And "for-cause" challenges could be subtly expanded to eliminate all jurors who will not expressly disavow and denounce the very existence of jury nullification. The supreme court could weigh in and allow seated holdouts to be removed much more easily by lowering the threshold to be declared an "obstinate" non-deliberator. Or simply declare "stubborn" belief in the truth automatic grounds for removal. The possibilities are endless. The state will try anything to keep up its conviction/subjugation rate. Here's the scam the courts have been running for the last 130 years, still going strong today:

1. **The oath binds the juror to decide "according to the law."**
2. **The court alone defines "the law" as its own instructions. Sparf.**
3. **The court then points to the oath as proof that the juror consented to be morally bound by the court's instructions.**

Thus the court uses the oath to create the very obligation that the oath is later said to enforce – a textbook bootstrap where the conclusion is smuggled into the premise. Thereby, the jury's ancient right to judge the law itself is silently erased. Now, violating the judge's instructions = violating the juror's oath. What a joke.

Actually, "instructions" are biased state propaganda – and can safely be ignored. Sparf + "Jury Instructions" have transformed juries from helpful, independent checks on government power into obedient enforcers of tyrannical legislation and judicial directives. This jury capitulation has allowed countless lives to be destroyed, with the number always growing, and growing quicker. Will the slaves rise up and lawfully defend themselves? It only takes two words: "Not Guilty."

Remember, you can safely swear: "I'll follow the law as instructed by the court." Judges can't erase your conscience. Nullifying the "law" is obeying the real law.

2. QUICK & EASY REDUCTION TO 6-PERSON JURIES

Nobody is entitled to a 12-person jury. It has been a privilege extended by the ruling class, who took away the mistaken "right" in 1970. Williams v. Florida, 399 U.S. 78 (1970). There is **"no discernible difference"** between the results of six and twelve jurors – the lazy dishonest court declared, one of them a lifelong KKK member, Hugo L. Black. This was the same court that had invented qualified immunity and gave police unprecedented "suspicion" powers just a few years prior. "The constitutional guarantee of a trial by jury does not require that jury membership be fixed at 12, a historically accidental figure." Williams. Voilà! Many hundreds of years of legal precedent wiped out as "historical accident" that nobody was ever entitled to in the first place. Five is too few, for now, but six is perfect, and twelve is an unnecessary privilege graciously granted to the downtrodden slaves by mistake. Ready to be taken away. Constitutionally.

This shift could happen quickly. In federal court, criminal jury size is governed by Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 23(a)–(b), which presumes twelve jurors but can be changed under the Rules Enabling Act without a new statute or constitutional amendment. A typical rulemaking cycle takes 12–36 months, so six-person juries could be imposed in just two to three years. At the state level, most jurisdictions set jury size by statute or rule, but a few state constitutions expressly guarantee 12-person juries for felony trials: California, Georgia, and Alaska. Only those three states would need a state constitutional amendment; the rest could eliminate the "right" to 12-person juries in a single legislative session, or with one judicial "opinion" – history be damned. Six already have: AZ; CT; FL; IN; MA; UT.



IMPLIED BINOMIAL JURY OUTCOMES - 12 vs. 6



12-PERSON JURY

IMPLIED MISTRIAL/ACQUITTAL RATE

from % of Jury Pool Voting "Not Guilty"

12-Person Jury – Binomial Model

% of Jury Pool voting NOT GUILTY	% of Cases ending in Acquittal/Mistrial
0.43%	5%
0.88%	10%
1.35%	15%
1.85%	20%
2.37%	25%
2.93%	30%
3.53%	35%
4.17%	40%
4.86%	45%
5.62%	**50%**
6.44%	55%
7.36%	60%
8.38%	65%
9.55%	70%
10.92%	75%
12.56%	**80%**
14.63%	85%
17.46%	90%
22.10%	95%

6-PERSON JURY

IMPLIED MISTRIAL/ACQUITTAL RATE

from % of Jury Pool Voting "Not Guilty"

6-Person Jury – Binomial Model

% of Jury Pool voting NOT GUILTY	% of Cases ending in Acquittal/Mistrial
0.86%	5%
1.75%	10%
2.68%	15%
3.66%	20%
4.69%	25%
5.78%	30%
6.93%	35%
8.17%	40%
9.49%	45%
10.92%	**50%**
12.47%	55%
14.17%	60%
16.06%	65%
18.19%	70%
20.63%	75%
23.53%	**80%**
27.11%	85%
31.88%	90%
39.31%	95%

3. STACKED "PETTY" MISDEMEANORS & CIVIL "INFRACTIONS"

When jury trials become unreliable to the state, the "rational" state response is to attack the individual in multiple ways, from different angles. Pushing for enhanced juror indoctrination and smaller juries inherently concedes that jurors have rights that the state is trying to take away. The stubborn Sixth Amendment makes outright abolition of all jury trials impossible, but the state will do the next best thing even more – displacement of the jury-trial right whenever possible. "Charge engineering" can reclassify conduct labeled as "criminal" into a constellation of "petty" misdemeanors and nominally "civil" infractions that fall outside the jury system by definition. Punishment and control are optimized, while constitutional protections are systematically bypassed by the state.

"Misdemeanors" already are charged on a massive scale in the United States, especially in state courts, where more than 13 million misdemeanor cases a year are filed. Generally, misdemeanors are those crimes punishable by a year or less in jail. Again, although the Sixth Amendment specifically applies to the states and sure appears to guarantee a jury trial in "all criminal prosecutions," the United States "supreme" court rejected the English language and officially adopted a bright-line rule to formalize its official revocation of the express written jury-trial right for "petty" crimes. Baldwin v. New York, 399 U.S. 66 (1970). Six months or less authorized time in jail is presumed to be "petty" and deemed unworthy of a jury trial. Thus, the court exempted those criminal prosecutions from the English language. This contrived ruling-class definition/classification conclusively eliminates jury-trial "rights" for many millions of Americans every single year.

Charge engineering takes conduct that could constitute a single alleged "serious" crime and breaks it into multiple lower-level offenses and violations spread across various criminal codes, regulatory schemes, and even sovereigns. Each charge is deliberately capped below the threshold that would invoke "rights" – a tactic explicitly endorsed by the supreme court. The court held that intentional designed stacking of multiple "petty" offenses to exceed six months' total exposure still does not trigger a jury-trial right. Lewis v. United States, 518 U.S. 322 (1996). Fines stack. Jail terms mount. Noncompliance spawns new charges. Each offense efficiently compounds state power. The cumulative effect is reliable state punishment effectively designed to increase control and eliminate rights.

The state can also relabel "crimes" as "civil" infractions and declare constitutional safeguards inapplicable on that basis. Burdens of proof are lowered. Intent is eliminated. Presumptions replace evidence. "Hearings" are formalities. "Guilt" is presumed. Ever tried to fight a red-light camera ticket? Or the U.S. can simply ramp up its ongoing criminal property theft known as civil asset forfeiture (often exceeding $4 Billion/year federally) and steal even more of your stuff that way. Thereby, the state "seizes" property on suspicion alone – then forces the owner to prove innocence. This inverts due process and makes harsh punishment routine, without need for a finding of guilt, or even a criminal charge, although a jury trial is sometimes available. Approximately 80% don't even fight for their stolen stuff.

4. DELAY, COST, AND EXHAUSTION BY FORCE

The "right" to a jury trial remains formally intact under the Sixth Amendment, but exercising it has become a "luxury" few can afford. This will be made worse – by design. Endless continuances, court backlogs, discovery delays, and protracted pretrial proceedings drain time, money, and will. Defendants held in pretrial detention on excessive bail face mounting pressure to plead guilty simply to move on with their lives. Easier pretrial detention will be demanded – and instituted. Prosecutors and courts control detention, and the calendar, turning the process itself into punishment – and agonizing pain – long before any "verdict" can be reached. A right that requires years and ruinous expense to invoke is no right at all, especially when you factor in the lawless "trial penalty." Jury nullification cannot play its role if the defendant is forced to give up. The state wins by default.

5. REMOVAL OF THE JURY-TRIAL "RIGHT" for even more "crimes"

United States "legal" practice has long required only bench trials for so-called "petty" offenses – now defined as those carrying maximum sentences of six months or less. Again, the supreme court invented this jury-exempt trial category despite the Sixth Amendment constitutional guarantee of a jury trial in "all criminal prosecutions." Just words. The "supreme" court could simply unilaterally expand this category to include all offenses with statutory maximums of say, three years, citing administrative necessity in the interests of "justice."

In 2025, England and Wales have already done that exact thing to address their "backlog" of 78,000 "criminal" cases. Following retired Court of Appeal judge Sir Brian Leveson's "independent" review, reforms have begun to be implemented to remove the right to a jury trial for all offenses likely to "attract" sentences of three years or less, reserving jury trials for only more "serious" indictable offenses. So psychopath judges who like to wear costumes with wigs will now preside over "Swift Court" bench trials that replace former adjudication by real people with at least a partially-functioning conscience. Voilà! Backlog solved. "Rights" gone. Two for one. This illustrates how a "supreme" judicial body can, under the guise of necessity and efficiency, quickly reallocate "authority" from juries to state-paid judges, and deliver more stolen power to the state. Without any real resistance.

> "Find out just what any people will quietly submit to and you have found out the exact measure of injustice and wrong which will be imposed upon them, and these will continue till they are resisted with either words or blows, or with both. The limits of tyrants are prescribed by the endurance of those whom they oppress."

-Frederick Douglass (1818–1895) – August 3, 1857.
American Abolitionist, Orator, and Reformer. West India Emancipation address.

CONCLUSION

"[T]he courts cannot search the minds of the jurors to find the basis upon which they judge. If the jury feels that the law under which the defendant is accused is unjust, or that exigent circumstances justified the actions of the accused, *or for any reason* which appeals to their logic or passion, the jury has the power to acquit, and *the courts must abide by that decision.*"

United States v. Moylan, 417 F.2d 1002, 1006 (4th Cir. 1969) (emphasis added).

The court is accurately describing a longstanding legal right, but is forced to pretend that it is only a "mere" power that happens to be exactly the same as a right. The doublespeak is classic government. The jury has the *right* to acquit. In this case, the truth seeps through the despicable required lies of the state because it has no choice. The court confesses its impotence. Reality speaks for itself.

Jury nullification is an undeniable right – since 1670. Bushel's Case (1670).

The courts won't call the right a right, because the very existence of their fake judicial authority depends completely upon semantics. They must deny the truth, regardless of how stupid, illogical, dishonest, and self-serving it makes them look. This is especially true now that the court has been systematically and obviously lying about the issue, to wrongly empower itself, every single day, for the last 130 years. The truth is an existential threat. They lie to exalt themselves. The very existence of the juror's undeniable right delegitimizes the entire legal profession. No legal "nuance" here. Restricting knowledge and censoring the truth. Sparf. In a jury trial, every single juror has infinitely more legal authority and useful knowledge than the judge and all the participating attorneys combined – even if the juror knows almost nothing and can only speak two words. Law is a joke.

The court system is a gang of parasites – who actually work for the jurors who make the real decisions. But they've got a sweet scam going. Courts insist that you must pretend their lies are truth and their "authority" is real – and turn over all your power to them – while giving them completely undeserved respect. In return – you get nothing. Government is just a delusional belief imposed by force. It cannot tell the truth because the "institution" itself is an illusion designed to empower violent lawless gangs to dominate, subjugate, and enslave. Government can only lie, cheat, steal, censor, and pretend to be right because it is well-armed. That is the law.

Imagine wearing a robe in public, systematically lying as your primary job condition and responsibility, and using those intentional lies to enslave innocent people who harmed nobody. That is a United States judge. A costumed disgrace.

My wife did NOT punch you in the face!

OR
kick you
in the shin!

There is no obligation to obey the government. It is a simple mental choice to accept that truth. Just stop obeying. Follow the real law – as you see it. Gun laws and drug laws are all unconstitutional. Nullify them. Stop paying taxes en masse, and use jury nullification systematically to prevent insane punishment for anyone making that wise, honorable, and heroic decision. You don't owe blood money to a gang of violent thieves who assert the right to control you and lie to you and steal your property, and murder people all over the world. It is a simple mental choice to end your bondage. It can be done one individual at a time, but the more the merrier. No one has any right to rule you – or anyone. Embrace that fact and your slavery can finally begin to end. Authority is fake. All lies. That is the law.

The People of the United States today remain exactly what government wants: passive, obedient, and ignorant – complicit in enforcing outrageous Empire lies. The People in general are weak-minded and cowardly, always surrendering to propaganda, evil, and fear. The Leviathan is the result. But the real truth is theirs to be seized – easily and without risk, peacefully and successfully, one individual at a time – through systematic jury nullification. Fact.

Jury nullification exists to bring tyrannical government to heel. At least a little... It exists to end slavery. And end felony tax "crimes." And end victimless "crimes." *It injects soul into the machine.* No victim. No crime. The jury decides.

Every individual juror can make the deciding vote for freedom – at ZERO risk to themselves. If you are unwilling to risk nothing for freedom, you deserve slavery.

Jury nullification is the only "legal" method for real, fast, legitimate change. Only when this undeniable fact is embraced and then executed by a small and wise minority of the United States jury pool, can the People free their minds and begin to break free from government. Until then, they will remain weak, pathetically inept, and willing slaves dominated by their rulers' obviously fake authority.

"From all these indignities, such as the very beasts of the field would not endure, you can deliver yourselves if you try, not by taking action, but merely by willing to be free. Resolve to serve no more, and you are at once freed. I do not ask that you place hands upon the tyrant to topple him over, but simply that you support him no longer; then you will behold him, like a great Colossus whose pedestal has been pulled away, fall of his own weight and break in pieces."

-Étienne de La Boétie (1530–1563)
French magistrate and political theorist.
The Politics of Obedience: The Discourse of Voluntary Servitude. Translated by Harry Kurz, with an introduction by Murray N. Rothbard. New York: Free Life Editions, 1975.
Original work composed c. 1552–1553; first published posthumously 1576.

ANARCATS
FLUFF THE STATE
When you realise it's wrong to hurt individuals and take their stuff.

When you realise that there's no exception to this, even for government.

CODA

True or False?

When you sit on a jury, you may vote on the verdict according to your conscience.

"True", you say—and you're right. But then . . .

Why do most judges tell you that you may consider "only the facts"—that you must not let your conscience, opinion of the law, or the motives of the defendant affect your decision?

In a trial by jury, the judge's job is to referee the event and provide neutral legal advice to the jury, properly beginning with a full explanation of a juror's rights and responsibilities.

But judges only rarely "fully inform" jurors of their rights, especially their right to judge the law itself and vote on the verdict according to conscience. In fact, judges regularly assist the prosecution by dismissing prospective jurors who will admit knowing about this right—beginning with anyone who also admits having qualms with the law.

We can only speculate on why: Disrespect for the idea of government "of, by, and for the people"? Unwillingness to share power? Distrust of the citizenry? Fear that prosecutors may damage their careers, saying they're "soft on crime"? Ignorance of the rights that jurors necessarily acquire when they take on the responsibility of judging an accused person?

How can people get fair trials if the jurors are told they can't use conscience?

Many people don't get fair trials. Jurors often end up apologizing to the person they've convicted—or to the community for acquitting a defendant when evidence of guilt seems perfectly clear.

Something is definitely wrong when the jurors feel apologetic about their verdict. They should never have to explain "I wanted to use my conscience, but the judge made us take an oath to apply the law as given to us, like it or not."

Too often, jurors who try to vote their consciences are talked out of it by other jurors who don't know their rights, or who believe they "have to" reach a unanimous verdict because the judge said that a hung jury would "unduly burden the taxpayers."

But if jurors were supposed to judge "only the facts", their job could be done by a judge. It is precisely because people have individual, independent feelings, opinions, wisdom, experience and conscience that we depend upon jurors to refuse to mindlessly follow the dictates of a judge or of a bad law.

So, when it's your turn to serve, be aware:

1. **You may, and should, vote your conscience;**
2. **You cannot be forced to obey a "juror's oath";**
3. **You have the right to "hang" the jury with your vote if you cannot agree with other jurors!**

What is FIJA, the Fully Informed Jury Association?

FIJA is a national educational non-profit organization which tells citizens more about their rights, powers, and duties as jurors than they are likely to be told in court.

FIJA believes that "liberty and justice for all" won't return to America until citizens are again fully informed of — and using — their power as jurors.

Return? Did judges fully inform jurors of their rights in the past?

Yes, it was normal procedure in the early days of our nation, and in colonial times. And if the judge didn't tell them, the defense attorney often would. America's founders realized that trials by juries of ordinary citizens, fully informed of their powers as jurors, would confine the government to its proper role as the servant, not the master, of the people.

Our third president, *Thomas Jefferson,* put it like this: "I consider trial by jury as the only anchor yet imagined by man by which a government can be held to the principles of its constitution."

John Adams, our second president had this to say about the juror: " It is not only his right, but his duty. . . to find the verdict according to his own best understanding, judgment, and conscience, though in direct opposition to thedirection of the court."

These sound like voices of experience. Were they?

Yes. Only decades had passed since freedom of the press was established in the colonies when a jury decided *John Peter Zenger* was "not guilty" of seditious libel. He was charged with this "crime" for printing true, but damaging, news stories about the Royal Governor of New York Colony.

"Truth is no defense," the court told the jury! But the jury decided to reject bad law and acquitted Zenger. Why? Because defense attorney *Andrew Hamilton* informed the jury of its rights: he told the story of *William Penn's* trial—of the courageous London jury which refused to find him guilty of preaching what was then an illegal religion (Quakerism). His jurors stood by their verdict even though they were held without food, water, or toilet facilities for several days.

They were then fined and imprisoned for acquitting Penn—until England's highest court acknowledged their right to reject both law and fact, and to find a verdict according to conscience. It was exercise of that right in the Penn trial which eventually led to recognition of free speech, religious freedom, and peaceful assembly as individual rights.

American colonists regularly depended on juries to thwart bad law sent over from England. The British then restricted trial by jury and other rights which juries had helped secure. Result? The Declaration of Independence and the American Revolution. Afterwards, to protect the rights they'd fought for from future attack, the founders of the new nation placed trial by jury—meaning tough, fully informed juries—in both the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Bad law—special-interest legislation which tramples our rights—is no longer sent here from Britain. But our own legislatures keep us well supplied. Now more than ever, we need juries to protect us!

Why haven't I heard about "jury veto power" or "jury rights" before?

During the 1800s, powerful special interest groups inspired a series of judicial decisions which tried to limit jury veto power. While no court has yet dared to deny that juries can "nullify" or "veto" a law, or "bring in a general verdict (i.e., judging both law and fact)", the Supreme Court in 1895 held, hypocritically, that jurors need not be told **their** rights!

Sparf v. United States, 156 U.S. 51 (1895).

That's why, these days, it's a rare and courageous attorney who will risk being cited for contempt for informing the jury about its rights without obtaining the judge's prior approval. It's also why the idea of jury rights is not taught in (public) schools.

Still, the jury's power to reject bad law continues to be recognized, as in 1972 when the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals held that the jury has an ...

". . . Unreviewable and irreversible power . . . to acquit in disregard of the instruction on the law given by the trial judge. The pages of history shine upon instances of the jury's exercise of its prerogative to disregard instructions of the judge; for example, acquittals under the fugitive slave law." (473 F. 2d 1113)

And let us never forget that in the Nuremburg trials of Nazi war criminals, the defendants argued that they were "only following the law." The Tribunal's response was, quite correctly, that they each had a personal responsibility to judge the morality of the law, and should have acted according to conscience!

How can one person make a difference?

BE ALERT! Almost everyday, new attempts are made to limit jury power, mostly via subtle changes in the rules of the courtroom procedure, sometimes by court decisions, legislation, or by the creation of special courts that do not allow jury trials for the accused.

BE AWARE! Thousands of harmless people are in prison simply because their juries weren't fully informed. U.S. now leads the world in percent of population behind bars! New prisons are springing up everywhere, and too many of them are filling up with people whose only "crime" was to displease the government "master", not to victimize anyone (in other words, political prisoners).

BE ACTIVE! Tell others what you know about jury veto power!* Before a jury reaches a verdict, each member should consider:

1. ***Is this a good law?***
2. ***If so, is the law being justly applied?***
3. ***Was the Bill of Rights honored in the arrest?***
4. ***Will the punishment fit the crime?***

Is there a local FIJA group?

Probably—most people who receive this leaflet get it from someone on a team of local activists. Local activists may also be working with lawmakers for passage of FIJA legislation; others my be participating in radio talk shows or placing ads and public service announcements, speaking to other local groups, or otherwise getting the word out.

Since 1991, local FIJA groups in 18 states have persuaded their state governors to proclaim September 5 (the day of Penn's acquittal) as "Jury Rights Day", often celebrating it by issuing news releases and leafleting courthouses—thus using our First Amendment right to explain how juries can protect the rest of our rights, simply by acquitting defendants been charged with breaking a bad law.

*Discretion may be the better part of valor: FIJA activists have been so effective at telling jurors the truth about jury veto power that judges and prosecutors nowadays not only try to keep fully informed citizens off of juries, but also have sometimes charged those who do inform them with contempt of court, even with jury tampering. So, if you decide to "be active", we advise you to observe any court order directed at your leafleting or other educational activity, and if you are empaneled to serve on a jury, not to distribute jury-power educational literature to your fellow jurors.

- TO RECEIVE MORE INFORMATION -

Call **1-800-TEL-JURY**, and tell FIJA where to send your free Jury Power Information Package. It contains a history of jury veto power and tells what to do if you're going to be on a jury (or facing one).

It also includes information on how you can support FIJA and a form for ordering materials.

TheFullyInformedJuryAssociationmaintainsauseful web site. It contains additional information about jury veto power, about FIJA, lists state coordinators and has archived files of our newsletters.

Our site is www.fija.org.
Restore liberty and justice by jury!

This leaflet is distributed locally by:

LVL

This brochure is not copyrighted and may be reproduced at will.

Your Jury Rights: True or False ?



Distributed by
Fully Informed Jury Association

www.fija.org
1-800-TEL-JURY

97% Estimated Convictions Obtained by Plea Bargain

64% Extra Punishment for Refusing a Plea Deal

1 Rank of U.S. in Incarceration

33 Years FIJA Has Fought for Jury Rights

“Firearms stand far above the importance of the Constitution itself. They are the American people's liberty, teeth, and keystone under independence. From the day the pilgrims landed to the present, events, occurrences, and tendencies prove that to ensure peace, security, and happiness, and fight tyrannical government, the rifle, the pistol, and the large-capacity assault weapon are all equally indispensable tools of the free People.

Every corner of this land knows and is entitled to firearms, and they are all properly held by Constitutional definition. The very atmosphere of firearms anywhere and everywhere restrains evil influences and actions. Firearms deserve a place of honor with all that is great and wonderful. When firearms go, all goes. We need them every hour.”

THE TRUTH

LVL

A PAINTING OF EVERY SINGLE

ILLEGAL FIREARM IN THE UNITED STATES

Your Actions, Your Rights

Jury Nullification may be the final peaceful barrier between law-abiding gun owners and a tyrannical government dependent upon disarming honorable citizens.

For jury nullification to protect gun ownership rights, and all constitutional rights of gun owners, it is necessary for jurors to learn about their authority to judge the law and its application.

To defend law abiding gun owners from routinely abused power of government, you must first get on the jury. During jury selection, lawyers and judges, who like to dictate the law, consistently attempt to remove thinking people from juries. The corrupted power of lawyers and judges is dependent upon ignorant, unthinking jurors who will do whatever they are told by government officers, even in violation of good conscience and constitutional law.

When questioned to identify your understanding of the law or issues, consider variously stating that you do not keep track of political issues, and that you can apply the law as instructed by the court. If asked, consider suggesting that you do not remember if you are a current member of any gun owner organizations or other groups, because you get too many junk mail memberships and solicitations. Imply an impartial attitude.

You may be the only thinking person on the jury. Judicial oaths and instructions to the jury are designed to fool people, and to entrench the raw power of government. Despite their officious nature, the instructions and oaths are rhetorical ruses which cannot be legally binding, or there would be no need or authority for independently thinking juries.

You hold an absolute, unalienable right to vote your conscience *in every regard.* If the accused person did not identifiably damage an identified person, or for any other reason you wish, you can find him or her not guilty, regardless of the other jurors. Just consistently state that the government prosecutor did not adequately prove the government case. Or you can also state no reason for your decision, as is your right.

Fully Informed Jury Association

Post Office Box 5570 •
Helena MT 59604-5570 •
1-406-442-7800 •
FAX 1-406-442-9332 •
INFO: 1-800-TEL-JURY •
www.fija.org •

The 2nd Amendment

"A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

SELF DEFENSE

SPORT SHOOTERS

COLLECTORS



HUNTERS

HOMELAND SECURITY AND DEFENSE OF FREEDOM

ALEXANDER HAMILTON, an American Founding Father, said in 1804, Jurors should acquit even against the judge's instruction.... "if exercising their judgment with discretion and honesty they have a clear conviction that the charge of the court is wrong."

- **Jury Power**
- **Jury Education**
- **Jury Nullification**
- **Jury Protection**

This brochure is not copyrighted and may be reproduced at will.

Constitutional Defense ~ Self Defense ~ Jury Defense

Constitutional Defense

The Revolutionary War veterans understood the Constitutionally described right to bear arms. They had just defeated the world's greatest military power, to create the world's most free and thus most prosperous nation. As long as they remained armed, no government, British or American, could subjugate them again. The citizen right to bear arms creates the ability to remain free under an armed government which obviously craves more power. The greatest threat to human rights is always from one's own government.

Self Defense

A modern example of the jury defending the right of self defense is Bernard Goetz, who defended himself with a firearm on a New York subway, against multiple assailants. The government, which craves absolute power, accused Goetz of several crimes, but a jury of his peers simply refused to convict him of criminal action, defending YOUR right to defend yourself when the police are not there to defend you, as usual. The jury acquitted Goetz because members of the jury understood their authority to judge the law and refused to apply the laws that the government imposed.

Jury Defense

You, as one individual, cannot do much to effect legislation. But YOU can effectively defend the Constitution when a fellow gun owner is on trial. One person can "hang" a Jury by refusing to convict. You cannot be punished for doing so. If you are called to serve on a jury, do so! In turn, if your rational exercise of a right is ever described as a gun crime, by a typical anti-gun prosecutor, wouldn't you want a member of your Jury to be an informed gun owner? You would want them to understand that they can hang a jury by simply stating that the government prosecutor failed to prove the government case. You can also state no reason for your verdict, as is your right.

The History of Jury Nullification

Liberty exists only among reasoning people who are tolerant of human diversity. Tyranny thrives on intolerance. Reasoning jurors defend liberty when they refuse to convict fellow citizens who are maliciously accused of crimes. Reasoning jurors stopped the Salem Witch Trials of 1692 and freed tax protesters during the Whiskey Rebellion of 1794. Juries refused to convict under the Fugitive Slave Act in 1850, during Prohibition 1920-30, Vietnam Objectors 1960-1970, Tax Protesters, Medical Marijuana Users, and others.



The defense of our liberties is first at the ballot box, then the soap box, then the jury box, and finally, failing all else, the cartridge box. The writers of the US Constitution understood that power always corrupts, and that the people must retain and understand the several processes to defend themselves from the greatest threat to liberty: one's own government.

With more than 20,000 inferior gun laws contradicting the superior or prevailing law of the US Constitution's Second Amendment, and an increasingly anti-gun, power craving institution of government prosecutors and judges, it is only a matter of time before you or friends are accused of a gun crime, unless gun owners fully understand and effect jury nullification for wrongful accusations of crime.

Corrupted, anti-gun prosecutors and judges are common. Anyone can easily become a lawyer or judge. It is just a process. The US is overrun by them. They are common people who hold no more intelligence or reasoning ability than any other common person, and often less because of their egos and insatiable craving for more power. The duty and design of the citizen jury is to apply reasoning without title-induced ego and craving for power of office. Lawyers and judges literally cannot understand that concept even if they read these words, which is why wise people instituted the citizen jury system with its authority over lawyers and judges.

The citizen understanding of jury nullification in the US has become critically important with the increasing gun confiscation laws supported by the Democrat/Republican Party, its politically appointed prosecutors, judges, and the United Nations leadership.

Repeated refusals by juries to convict effectively informs legislators and prosecutors that the law is NOT supported by the community. Acquittals and hung juries are politically embarrassing to the power-craving prosecutors, legislatures, bureaucrats and most judges. Do not underestimate the effect that acquittals have on the currently out-of-control law and regulation writing process. One thinking person among each of only a few juries, who understands the value of individual liberty that cost so many lives to create, can regain gun owner rights in the US.

Educating Prospective Jurors

FIJA chapters, members and informed gun owner groups can spread the word in local media regarding the authority of the jury.

FIJA offers various materials, and can often offer helpful strategic suggestions for educating the public -- and thus the jury pool -- for a particular Second Amendment-related jury trial.

Visit FIJA at www.fija.org for more literature, various educational tapes, and transcripts.

Act now! Call 1-800-TEL-JURY for a free information kit !

Strategies that Work

- Hand out FIJA Literature
- Give local Radio and TV interviews
- Speak about FIJA to Local Groups
- Write Letters to the Editor
- Put up FIJA Posters
- Leave FIJA brochures at gun shops
- Leave FIJA brochures at ranges
- Contact FIJA for more ideas

LVL

“Drug Prohibition works great injury to the cause of so-called temperance. Prohibition is an evil species of intemperance within itself, for it goes well beyond the bounds of reason in that it attempts to control a man's appetite by legislation, and makes a crime out of things that are not crimes.

Any Prohibition law strikes a blow at the very principles upon which the United States government was said to have been founded. Intoxicating drugs deserve a place of honor with all that is great and wonderful. When intoxicants go, all goes. We need them every hour.”

THE TRUTH

LVL

A PAINTING OF EVERY SINGLE

ILLEGAL "DRUG" IN THE UNITED STATES

"I think you can still become a gentleman someday if you understand and abide by the rules of decent society, Danny. Danny... There's a lot of, uh, well, badness in the world today. I see it in court every day. I've sentenced boys younger than you to the gas chamber. Didn't want to do it. Felt I owed it to them. The most important decision you can make right now is what do you stand for Danny? Goodness... or badness?"

-Judge Elihu Smails

Bushwood Country Club co-founder and director of the caddie scholarship program.

LVL


OUR DREAMS
WON'T FIT
IN BALLOT
BOXES
~~SOAP~~
~~BALLOT~~
JURY
CARTRIDGE

LVL

YOU CAN BE AS POLITE AS YOU WANT
THE STATE WILL STILL
FUCKING KILL YOU

“In those days there was no king in Israel. Everyone did what was right in his own eyes.”

-Judges 21:25 (ESV)

CLARK COUNTY DISTRICT COURT
Video Conference
I think it's time he gets a taste of something else.
01/03/24
AM
LAS VEGAS
"LAW"

CLARK COUNTY DISTRICT COURT
Video Conference
I think it's time she gets a taste of something else.
01/03/24
11:07:08 AM
LAS VEGAS
"LAW"

CLARK COUNTY DISTRICT COURT
Video Conference
01/03/24
AM
LAS VEGAS
"LAW"

CLARK COUNTY DISTRICT COURT
Video Conference
01/03/24
LVL
LAS VEGAS
"LAW"

"Laws: We know what they are, and what they are worth! They are spider webs for the rich and mighty, steel chains for the poor and weak, fishing nets in the hands of government."

-Pierre-Joseph Proudhon (1809-1865)
French philosopher. Father of Anarchism.

: a political theory holding all forms of governmental authority to be unnecessary and undesirable and advocating a society based on voluntary cooperation and free association of individuals and groups

Anarchy just means no rulers.

Fin